

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

APRIL, 1918.

AN UNNOTICED 'SUPPLETIVE' VERB.

THE *Antiatticist* in Bekker's *Anecdota* 91, 19 (cit. Bruhn, *Wortschatz Menanders*, p. 21), says: εἰσπορεύομαι καὶ ἐκπορεύομαι ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐξέρχομαι, and the statement is confirmed by numerous passages in κοινὴ authors, e.g. οἱ διὰ τῆς πύλης εἰσπορευόμενοι, Polybius X. 15, 3-4; πάντες ὁμνῶνσι καθ' ἓνα προπορευόμενοι, id. VI. 21, 3; τῶν καταπορευομένων (said of exiles), id. IV. 17, 9; τὰ κατ' ἰδίαν ἀδικήματα κοινῇ μεταπορεύεσθαι, id. II. 8, 10. Even these few passages suggest that the rule ought to be extended to cover other compounds of ἔρχομαι.

The fullest evidence as to Hellenistic usage in this respect may be obtained from a study of Hatch and Redpath's *Concordance to the Septuagint*. Under the heading ἐξέρχεσθαι about 708 passages are quoted, and of these only 4 contain a Present or Imperfect form. All the rest offer forms from the stems ἐξελθ-, ἐξελευσ- and ἐξεληλυθ-. The explanation is provided by the following table of statistics compiled from Hatch and Redpath:

Verb.	Present or Imperfect.	Other Tenses.
ἐξέρχομαι	4 occurrences	704 occurrences
ἐκπορεύομαι	170 "	4 "
προσέρχομαι	1 "	116 "
προσπορεύομαι	24 "	0 "
παρέρχομαι	3 "	157 "
παραπορεύομαι	38 "	2 "
προέρχομαι	0 "	12 "
προπορεύομαι	30 "	7 "
συνέρχομαι	1 "	24 "
συμπορεύομαι	17 "	11 "
εἰσέρχομαι	9 "	720 "
εἰσπορεύομαι	160 "	8 "

The figures are approximate. 'Other Tenses' means, on the one hand, forms like ἐξῆλθον, ἐξελεύσομαι, ἐξελήλυθα, and on the other forms like ἐκπορεύσομαι, etc.

The conclusion is obvious. The true Present belonging to *ἐξήλθον*, *ἐξελήλυθα*, etc., is not *ἐξέρχομαι*, but *ἐκπορεύομαι* (as *φέρω* is the Present belonging to *οἶσω*, etc.), and similarly in the other cases.

This may be confirmed by passages in which the Present or Imperfect occurs in close proximity to the other tenses which really belong to it. Thus in Polyb. X. 15, 3-4 (see above) the persons designated as *οἱ διὰ τῆς πύλης εἰσπορευόμενοι* are referred to a little later as *τοὺς εἰσεληλυθότας*, and in Polyb. IV. 17, 9-18, 1, the words *τῶν καταπορευομένων* are followed at a short interval by *παραχρῆμα κατελθόντες* and *τῶν κατεληλυθότων*. In Ezekiel 46, 10, we read: *ἐν τῷ ἐκπορεύεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐξελεύσεται μετ' αὐτῶν*.

Other compounds have been purposely omitted from the table because their figures are too low to permit of any conclusion.

The uncompounded *ἔρχομαι* is not at all rare in Hellenistic Greek, and maintains its existence as the true Present belonging to *ἦλθον*, *ἐλήλυθα*, etc. It is found about 200 times (Present and Imperfect) in the Septuagint.

RODERICK MCKENZIE.

MEHERCLE AND HERC(V)LVS.

EVERYONE interested in Latin Etymology knows the last word on *mehercle*, that the old vocative of *meus* is prefixed to the old Second Declension form *Herc(u)lus*, Voc. -*li*. Without discussing whether this explanation is wholly true or partly wrong, I wish here to disqualify two pieces of evidence. Both originate from a marginal annotation on Rufinus' translation of Eusebius' *Church History* (4, 9, 3 'illud mehercule magnopere curabis') in, I think, a seventh-century English MS. These marginalia were used for the Leyden Glossary and for the common source of the EE (Épinal and Erfurt) and Corpus Glossaries. The compiler of Leid. transferred them unaltered to his pages; and in the section devoted to Rufinus glosses we find (§ 35, 19) *Mehercule: mi fortis*. The other compiler often recasts them for dictionary purposes. He gave this item the form *Herculus: fortis* (Ep. 11 A 26 = C.G.L. V. 364, 23 = Corp. H. 54). But of course the original annotation *mi fortis* was a mere lucky guess, and the substitution of 'Herculus' for *Hercules* was sheer ignorance.

Latin Glossaries have many such pitfalls for the unwary. Occasionally a young scholar who intends to spend his life in the pleasant sport of conjectural emendation tries his prentice hand on glosses, but with comical results. Knowledge is necessary for successful emendation. In all cases, knowledge of 'Ueberlieferungsgeschichte' and the practice of medieval scribes. In the case of an author, knowledge of his diction and style. In the case of glosses, knowledge how the glossary was compiled.

W. M. LINDSAY.

TOWARDS A RECONSTRUCTION OF THE TEXT OF PROPERTIUS.

I PURPOSE in this essay to declare by means of a few chosen examples the theory and method upon which I have for over twelve years been proceeding to the restoration of the text of Propertius. I had always hoped to present my results first in their final form; but the long delays and the immediate circumstance of war compel me to a partial presentation of what is now in all essentials a finished work. The examples I choose are mostly those which I used in 1911 in a paper read before the Philological Societies of Cambridge and Oxford; nothing but detail has been changed in any part of my theory since that date.

In the first place it is my design to prove beyond doubt that the received text of Propertius has suffered serious dislocation; thereafter I hope to establish more than a probability that this dislocation befel a manuscript (which was an ancestor of our archetype), written upon pages and leaves of a certain discoverable number of lines; and in the third place I shall indicate, by examples perhaps too few to establish proof, a subsidiary theory which I believe to be capable of proof in detail, a theory of the technique of the poet which attributes to him a 'numerical scheme of composition' for each several poem. By combining these three ideas in the reconstruction of one particular portion of the text I shall present in little a type of my work as a whole.

(a) For the proof of dislocation I have chosen out of many the following poems (old notation): II. x. xi. xiii. xiv. with reference to II. xx. 21; xxiv. 1.

(b) For the recovery of the pagination of the archetype I add II. iv.; iv. i. 38-70 (III. xviii. 8; xx. 10; I. xxii.).

(c) I analyze the numerical schemes of II. xii.; I. xiv.; III. xii.; with reference to III. i. 39, iii. 21; IV. ii. 57; also II. xxvi.; II. xxxiv. 67-94.

A. DISLOCATION.

The theory of dislocation is of course nothing new; but to English readers, accustomed to the texts of Palmer, Phillimore, and Hosius, almost no hint of it is given. I recommend the text of Baehrens as that which will best assist the following of my arguments.

Our II. x. xi. xii. xiii. xiv. is a region to which Lachmann invited attention. In x. Propertius states that Augustus and his wars will henceforward occupy his Muse, *quando scripta puella mea est*. In first youth he sang of loves, but *émeutes* are to be the theme of the end of his life. Yet in the preface to this

book (and prefaces are the latest written portions of books) he confesses that Cynthia is all the theme and inspiration of which he is capable (II. i.), and in vv. 40-42 apologizes to Maecenas for not 'thundering of Gods and Giants' or tracing a Trojan pedigree for Caesar. And in the poem earliest in date of Book II. (written only one month after our Book I., which Martial called the *carmen iuvenale Properti*) we find him saying *turpis de te iam liber alter erit* (II. iii. 3, 4). The earliest and latest poems of Book II. thus agree as to its content; poem x. implies recantation and a time of life inconsistent with a *iuvenale carmen* (v. 7). But x. is confirmed by xi., where in an elegy of six verses, whose brevity is hard to match, he bids Cynthia a stern farewell once more—so final a farewell that it is at least a surprise to find poem xii. amorous, xiii. 1-16 containing a reference to Cynthia as sole worthy critic of his verse, and love and Cynthia the sole subjects of the rest of the book.

xiii. 25 is the verse which chiefly awakened Lachmann's suspicions: *sat mea † sit magna † si tres sint pompa libelli, quos ego Persephonae maxima dona feram*. (Here I find any part of *magnus* intolerable with *maxima* following, and would read *sat mea, sat, magici si tres sint pompa libelli*. . .) Lachmann maintained not without reason that *tres libelli* means three volumes of poetry. In that case we are now in the third, not the second, volume; for the poet is giving to Cynthia directions for his funeral, presumably imminent, and not to be postponed while a complete book is in the writing. Professor H. E. Butler (*Propertius*, Introd. p. 14) fails of his accustomed felicity when attempting the refutation of Lachmann. '*Libelli*,' he says, 'does not necessarily mean *books*; it may be used quite vaguely in the sense of *poems, writings*.' He quotes from our Book I. *i quaeso et tristis istos compone libellos* (ix. 13); but Ponticus is engaged upon a Thebaid, which was presumably divided into books, without undue vagueness. From III. he quotes *fortunata, meo si qua es celebrata libello* (ii. 17 [15]), but omits the pentameter: *carmina erunt formae tot monimenta tuae*. Propertius refers to the new book of which this is part of the Introduction, the separate *libellus* containing *tot carmina*. '*Tres*,' continues Professor Butler, 'need not be taken literally, though *tres libelli* might mean no more than *three elegies*.' '*Tres* may equally be regarded as meaning *a few*.' For this equally cogent view he quotes from IV. x. 26 *iugera terna Corae*; but at Cori to this day the site is divided into *three* roughly equal parts by the configuration of the rock, and I would venture to suggest that Propertius is here making a learned reference to this fact.¹ 'Or,' says Professor Butler, 'as the mystic number three,' which, in view of magic-loving Persephone, is indeed part of the truth—but only if it is *three* and not two. 'The truth of Lachmann's view is a matter of opinion.' I believe it to be rather a matter of courage. *Tres libelli* means *three books*;

¹ Romulus distributed to his followers *bina iugera uiritim*, and his own *sors heredium* on the Palatine was 'Roma Quadrata' or one *ager quadratus* of two acres in extent. (See the passages discussed in my article on the Palatium: *J.R.S.*, 1914, vol. i.) The king of Cori had an *arx* in three sections, which Propertius might

scornfully call *iugera*; but if his followers had had land distributed to them on the equitable lines of Romulus, each might have possessed three 'acres,' of which a conquering Roman dispossessed him. At least, I cannot grant that *terna* here is loosely used.

A
and the
author
Propert
line act
mann's
On the
tention
our Bo
whose p
known t
actually
shown n
Ullman.
dactylic
adsiduo
the first
sound.
the good
subscrip
explicit
original
connecte
quartus
source).
Cynthia
our thir
made up
of Roma
arrangem
Lach
Preface t
to August
is concer
At II. xx
orbis lu
half-year
the begin
Still
cum sis i
Cynthia,
of the co
is undim
Let

and therefore we must admit that the verse II. xiii. 25 was composed by its author as part of a *third* book. 'Nonius (p. 169) says of the word *secundare*: *Propertius elegiarum libro tertio, iam liquidum nautis aura secundat iter*. The line actually occurs in III. xxi. 14. In view of the general weakness of Lachmann's argument it seems wanton to suppose *tertio* to be an error for *quarto*.¹ On the contrary, I regard Nonius as strongly confirming Lachmann's main contention that there were five books in all. The MSS. of Martial (xiv. 188) call our Book I. *Cynthia, siue monobiblos* (cf. Prop. II. xxiv. 2). The series of books whose patron was Maecenas begins at II. i. Nonius is evidence that these were known to the grammarians as the *Elegiarum libri*, of which our third book was actually the third. That these were considered separate from the *Cynthia* is shown not only by its sub-title *monobiblos*, but by a fact adduced by Mr. B. L. Ullman. When Caesius Bassus wishes to quote from Propertius a perfect dactylic pentameter to match the first pentameter in Tibullus I. i. *dum meus adsiduo luceat igne focus*, his choice falls on *unde meus ueniat mollis in ora liber*, the first in our II. i., not on *Cynthia* i. 20, still less on 4 or 14 with their Greek sound. This certainly suggests a *Liber Elegiarum* beginning at II. i. 1. And the good MSS.¹ B and H point to the same conclusion, for they bear a double subscription after our Book IV. *Propertii Aurelii Nautae monobiblos feliciter explicit uel liber elegiarum Propertii finit*. The first half refers back to the original title of our Book I., the second seemingly to a second title, more closely connected with our Book IV. (The MSS. μ and ν however give *elegiarum liber quartus et ultimus explicit* (μ), *finit* (ν), which seems to derive from the same source). It is a fair inference that our archetype combined within one cover both *Cynthia* and *Liber Elegiarum*; but to the grammarians they were distinct. If our third book is truly third of the periodic *elegiarum libelli*, which together made up the *Liber*, our second, which is far longer than any other extant book of Roman Elegies, must contain both the first and the second of the author's arrangement.

Lachmann proposed to end his Book II. before poem x. and to make x. the Preface to his Book III. (He counted the *Cynthia* as Book I.) But the address to Augustus there is quite inconsistent with what follows, for the rest of his book is concerned with love and *Cynthia*. And there are still weightier objections. At II. xx. 21 Propertius gives an explicit date: *septima iam plenae deducitur orbita lunae, cum de me et de te compita nulla tacent*. He looks back over the half-year that separates the day from that of the publication of the *Cynthia* and the beginning of their notoriety.

Still later in our book (xxiv. 1) he writes: *tu loqueris* (a friend is speaking) *cum sis iam noto fabula libro, et tua sit toto Cynthia lecta foro*. One book, the *Cynthia*, is all that has yet been published. Here too we are within the period of the composition of the immediately succeeding volume, and his popular fame is undiminished.

Let us return to II. xiii. Here at v. 13 he makes one of his two references

¹ For these see *Journal of Philology*, xxxi. pp. 162-196.

to detractors (the other is in the Introduction to Book III.): *populi confusa ualet fabula: nam domina iudice tutus ero*. The *fabula* is now not unequivocal praise. He must then have published, since II. xxiv. was composed, something which has tarnished the fame of the *Cynthia*. And twelve lines later in our texts comes the reference to *tres libelli*.

Lachmann then, though right in his suspicions, must be wrong in his constructive criticism, when he constitutes x. the first poem of a third book thence succeeding. For at least two succeeding poems *must* belong to a second book.

Yet II. x., considered alone, is remarkably like the introduction to a new book, as Lachmann perceived, and moreover provides detail indicating its date. In the Introduction to Book III. (i. 16) he writes of *finem imperii Bactra futura*. Augustus has not yet reached the limits of Alexander. The Arabian expedition of Aelius Gallus took effect in the year 23. Since III. xviii. dates from August of that year (Marcellus's death), and the Palatine Library (i. 38) *cannot* have been opened earlier than 24 B.C., owing to Augustus's absence from Rome, 27-24, and was probably not ready till 23-22 B.C. (see *C.Q.* XI. p. 104; *J.R.S.* 1914), we can be sure that this book was being composed during 23. One of its earliest poems (iv. v.) foretells the Eastern expeditions of Gallus and Agrippa. Crassus is not yet avenged: *Crassos clademque piate; ite et Romanae consulite historiae* (iv. 9): *Crassi signa referite domum* (v. 48). *Arma deus Caesar dices meditatur ad Indos* (iv. 1).

But in our poem II. x. the East is already subject: India bows down (15), Arabia trembles (16), Crassus is avenged (24), Euphrates is no more a barrier (13). We seem to be in the period subsequent to 20 B.C., when the standards were recovered, a period which saw the composition (actually in 16 B.C.) of IV. vi., where vv. 79, 80 = our 13; 81, 82 = our 17, 18; 83, 84 = our 13, 14, *ire per Euphraten, iam negat Euphrates*.

Now if II. x. really dates from any year subsequent to 23 B.C. it can only belong to our Book IV.; for the date of Book III. is firmly fixed in 23 B.C. But we have already noticed that the poet explicitly records in vv. 7, 8 the passing of his youth and the *completion* of his love-elegies. So let me point out two tentative suggestions by previous critics.

Postgate, unable to accept II. x. 7, 8 in a book concerned chiefly with *Cynthia*, brackets them, and proposes that they should be inserted in the present first poem of Book IV. But is it likely that a scribe who found this reference to *aetas extrema* in Book IV. would transplant it to a passage in Book II.? And how else could a single couplet be spirited *backwards*: the tendency is always to insert omissions at some later point. Baehrens records an even more remarkable proposal of Fontaine with regard to the six verses of xi. immediately succeeding x. 26. He wished to join them to the last couplets of our Book III. and make them part of the conclusion of the *Dirae* and recantation of III. xxiv. xxv. It is a curious coincidence, perhaps, that two of the acutest Propertian scholars should independently connect verses from this region with the point at which Books III. and IV. now divide; not least because Book IV. is the only one which

A
begins v
which o
is on a n
To
pected b
words, v
cluded;
as well
our Book
we have
Wit
suffered

Luc
Propert
the effect
tury in a
school of
for this a
some of t
story ma
the arch

Lach
of two v
end of th
out of th
at the en
easily inf

The
the order
point in
the latest
archetype
object of
the verse
Between
intervene,
unascetic
No instar
mutilated
accident,
into play

begins without an Introduction or Dedication of a formal kind, and the one which of all the books we should most expect to be so adorned, seeing that it is on a more elaborate scale and concerned with higher matters than the rest.

To recapitulate. Concentrating upon one region of the text, already suspected by the prince of Latinists because of the simple meaning of two Latin words, we have seen that II. x. xi. refer to our Books I. II. III. as already concluded; that xiii. refers to Book II. as already concluded (13) and to Book III. as well under way (25), but at the same time that much later in the period of our Book II. nothing but the *Cynthia* in one volume has yet appeared, and that we have not passed the seventh month since its appearance.

Without calling more evidence I submit that it is proved that our text has suffered from dislocation of a complicated kind.

B. THE MS. WHICH SUFFERED DISLOCATION.

Lucian Mueller¹ claims to have sought, but in vain, for the pagination of a Propertian archetype. Scaliger repeated the story of Alessandro Alessandri to the effect that the archetype of Propertius was discovered in the fifteenth century in a battered condition; he made it an excuse for the inauguration of a school of jig-saw which is not yet dead. (But the key-picture may be a necessity for this art). I have said elsewhere (*Journ. of Philol.* XXXI. pp. 175, 195) that some of the MSS. of the family I call C are themselves dislocated, and that the story may refer to a really old and really battered copy, which was not however the archetype.

Lachmann's reconstructed archetype of Lucretius was the immediate parent of two very old but extant MSS. The isolated fragments copied out at the end of the later MS. were still in their place in the earlier. Certain leaves fell out of the archetype in the period between the two, and were inserted together at the end. The number of lines upon the leaves of the archetype could thus be easily inferred; in old MSS. this is usually constant throughout.

The archetype of Propertian MSS. is very far behind our extant copies, and the order of its text was theirs. If dislocation has taken place, it was at a point in the tradition still further back than our archetype, which was, of course, the *latest* from which all extant MSS. are descended. The pagination of the archetype is likely to be immaterial; that of its damaged ancestor must be the object of our quest. Fulgentius in the sixth century quotes as from Propertius the verse *diuidias mentis conficit omnis amor*, which is not found in our MSS. Between him and the scribe of our Neapolitanus at Wolfenbüttel over 600 years intervene, plenty of time for the decay of a binding or for the neglect of so unascetic a poet, even to the tearing out of his leaves to serve a holier purpose. No instance can be quoted of a classical writer's works being deliberately mutilated and disarranged. The damage in our case was presumably due to accident, ignorance, or mere age. The critical faculty is more likely to come into play when the damage has to be made good as far as possible—that is,

¹ Preface to his Teubner text.

in a copy of a dislocated exemplar. Signs of editing then in our archetype would confirm the theory of dislocation at an earlier stage. There are many such signs.

Signs of Dislocation and of Editing in our IV. 1.

I have briefly pointed out in *C.Q.* for April, 1917, XI. p. 103, some of the reasons which have led me to the assurance that in our II. xxxiv. 61-94 we have *two* distinct references to Virgil, of which vv. 61-66 belongs to the year 23-22 B.C., while vv. 67-94 are a complete elegy removed from the end of the *Cynthia* and of date 26 B.C. The junction of such passages from kinship of subject (and that a favourite subject) would be a natural idea for an editing corrector, whose exemplar had fallen to pieces. I also refer there to the fate of the passage on the poet's birthplace, our IV. i. 61-66. In connection with this latter I propose now to discuss briefly the whole region of the text, IV. i. 38-70.

(i.) Lachmann postulated a lacuna after 38 and after 54. The intervening passage, 39-54, is certainly inconsistent with what precedes and what follows. But let us take certain points in detail:

(a) In vv. 1-38 the poet has sung only of the small beginnings of Rome, the nakedness of the land of Romulus. In v. 48 Italy is already a *felix terra*; the omens of Troy have been fair (*huc melius*, 39; *iam bene*, 41). There is no hint of *lacrimae* in 1-38, or 39-54, or in 55-70; yet in 73 Propertius is rebuked for the sadness of his note.

(b) But vv. 87, 88 sound like an *anticipation* of such a passage as contains our vv. 47, 48, and 53, 54. Yet they are themselves inconsistent with the *lacrimae* of 73; for the soothsayer rebukes Propertius for his sadness, and then proceeds to describe Aeneas's pilgrimage as *longa sepulchra*.

(c) vv. 71-76 and 87, 88 prepare one for a recitation *by the soothsayer* of the *fata Aeneae*: Propertius himself, the speaker of 1-38, 55-70, seems rather interested in the *moenia* of Romulus (57). When the soothsayer proceeds to his recitation, vv. 109-118 take us only to the scattering of the Greek fleet, and stop short exactly at the point where the *fata* become of interest to Rome. Our vv. 39-48 pick up the tale at this very point.

(d) The style of vv. 39-54 is more like the soothsayer's than like that of 1-38; but style alone is a dangerous criterion.

Many scholars have wished to connect 38 and 55, 56: *sanguinis altricem non pudet esse lupam, optima nutricum nostris lupa Martia rebus*. . . . If we could show cause for the rejection from this passage of vv. 39-54 the juncture would be made.

(ii.) But vv. 55 to 70 constitute a still more vexed passage.

(a) Bachrens (at 57) speaks of a corrector, *qui fragmina dissita collegit*. Luetjohann proposes to strike out as spurious vv. 65, 66. Housman would insert them in the last poem of the *Cynthia*, much as Postgate would

join the most recalcitrant couplet of II. x. to the poem now under discussion. But can they be severed from 61-64? The *patria* of 60 can only mean Italy, whose centre is Rome, in view of *moenia* (56, 57). The poet claims to be a good Augustan by now and no more a provincial Umbrian. With this 61-66 are quite at variance. In 65 I accept Professor H. E. Butler's correction of my conjecture; for the evidence on which *scandentis qui Asis* . . . is based see my article, *Journ. of Philol.* XXXI. p. 170. Verses 63 to 66 become thus altogether Umbrian: the *patria* of 64 cannot be the *patria* of 60. Again, 57 and 60 invoke the poet's powers to attempt a quasi-heroic strain. It is therefore strange that in 61, 62 he should deprecate 'shaggy' epic and call upon Bacchus for a smooth wreath of his ivy, the more so that in 73 Apollo, the founder and the seer of fate, but not Bacchus of the lighter lay, is in question. Of all occasions on which Bacchus might be invoked surely the least likely is when a song of foundations is to be assayed *pio uersu*; not even Ennius' addiction to Bacchus (61) will make this tolerable in a city where Bacchic rites were still forbidden in public. Here then is another passage, 61-66, which we must mark off from 55-60 as clearly as we mark off that from 39-54.

(b) Verses 67-70 are inconsistent not only with 61-66 (*Roma, tibi surgit opus: superbiat Vmbria libris*), but with both 55-60 and 71-74, which agree together that the poet's intention has been to sing of foundations and of fate (71); now he inopportunately asserts that his plan is rather to sing a Hesiodic strain, of things holy, of days, of ancient place-names. The soothsayer was hard of hearing if he thought him rushing at all rashly to sing of fate.

I should not give space to all these difficulties, if I had no solution of them. The first suggestion which I desire to emphasize is that vv. 61-66 do not appear here by chance. The reference to the *patria* in each passage has led an editing corrector to insert them, where a superficial likeness tempted him. But their removal from another place was surely conditioned by a dislocation there, which obscured meanings and caused the critical faculty to come into play. This combination of autobiographical passages is to be likened to that of the passages concerning Virgil (p. 64, above); nor is that the only parallel in our text. In order to understand how vv. 61-66 came to be removed, we must consider, and if possible visualize, the conditions under which the copyists of a damaged exemplar would work.

The Copying of a Damaged Exemplar.

It is most improbable, for instance, that a scribe copying three consecutive and complete quires would extract from an intelligible context a passage within these clear bounds and insert it at a distance of eight whole quires. If on the other hands, after three complete quires, he came upon a number of loose leaves comprising part of the next quire and parts of quires further on which had at some time fallen out, he might well hesitate to copy them in the haphazard order

in which he found them, and search for contexts or for kindred subject-matter. He would be particularly puzzled if, after a gap in the sense, he came upon a series of consecutive pages the first of which was headed by *the last lines of a lost elegy*. What to do with this headless and bodiless tail, which his honesty forbids him to omit? He will first look for a body it might fit; but failing that he must either spoil his consecutive series by a fragmentary opening, or hold the short passage in reserve till a somewhat similar context arrives, or till he reaches the end of the series, when he will perhaps insert it at the bottom of a leaf, as he would do with an accidental omission later detected.

Lachmann and Schrader offer us a good example of what I mean at II. iv. In the MSS. *his saltem ut teneat iam finibus* follows without sign upon v. 44 of elegy iii. Scaliger perceived that this passage cannot belong to iii. At the same time the MSS. begin a new elegy at v. 11, *multa prius*; and ten verses are too few for a complete elegy from 1 to 10. Lachmann, Schrader, and others therefore begin the elegy at *his saltem* and ignore the MSS. at v. 11, though the conspicuous illuminated letter now given to *Multa* was the last thing likely to have shifted on this page. Imagine our scribe, perhaps less of a Latinist than Schrader or Lachmann, faced with such a problem as this. He has ended a page of the exemplar at *Hesperios* (II. iii. 44); the next leaf is a loose one followed by others also loose. He has no certainty that the next *was* the next always. He dare not pretend that the M of *Multa* is not illuminated; shall he begin his next page with the beginning of iv. from that point and keep the ten first verses of the exemplar's page in reserve? He decides that the *fines* indicated in the first lines are the East and West of iii. 44, and that these ten verses are but the end of iii.

Let us imagine the case slightly different. He comes to a full stop at the bottom of a leaf of the exemplar at iii. 44: he has no idea which of the jumbled loose leaves following ought to come next. So he sorts them through, and finds one at some distance beginning *his saltem ut teneat iam finibus*. He snatches at a straw, and infers that the *fines* are our East and West, and brings the whole leaf up to follow iii. 44. If he does not alter the disordered units *within themselves* and respects always the illuminated letters, he will on the whole be doing less harm than Lachmann and Schrader. But he may not be consistent any more than later editors. He may, in such a disordered region as we conceive, begin to copy a leaf next in order and after a line or two perceive that it is a false join. He may then set this leaf aside for a more favourable moment, and when that comes insert *the rest* of the page, with a reference back to its first verses already copied. Or he may treat certain of the loose and isolated leaves as units in themselves, to be doctored into some sort of literary shape. He may indicate the beginning of a new elegy, when really it is only the beginning of an isolated page, to show that at least the following verses do not belong to the leaf last copied. This supposition would explain, for instance, the appearance of an otherwise inexplicable illuminated letter in *cod. Neapolitanus* at II. xxvi. 29: *Seu mare per longum mea cogitet ire puella*. If in this neighbourhood a

new lea
might i
verse w
But for
first to
an exen
judged
briefly s

We
hint her
grounds
and IV.
The sun
that is a
a third
verses.
but on
four of t
ally at
There to
that of a
At the e
and mo
lines lon

Aft
critical
to xxiv.
three m
47-62, x

We
suppose
the exta
most pre
a leaf ha
of a lac
pointed
9 to xx.
all detai

Let
42 + 24 -
xxii. at l
cruces S

new leaf began which was isolated from the context once preceding, a scribe might indicate this isolation by giving the sign for a new elegy to the first extant verse which could by any manner of means stand at the head of the passage. But for suppositions of this sort to become concrete, it is absolutely necessary first to recover *the number of lines* which stood upon each page and leaf of such an exemplar. I shall omit the experimental stages, the false trails, and the misjudged evidence among which I have from time to time wandered, and present briefly some of the facts of our case.

The Pagination of the Damaged Exemplar.

We return first to the region whence we set out, II. x. xi. xiii. Is there any hint hereabouts of a common factor to the various sums of verses which on literary grounds awoke suspicion? If x. and xi. seem to belong between our Books III. and IV., perhaps they stood upon a loose leaf which fell out from that region. The sum of verses is $26 + 6 = 32$; this would mean a page of as few as 16 verses, that is an uncial page. But we notice at once that xiii., which seems to belong to a third book (v. 25), breaks off in sense (and in most modern editions) after 16 verses. Turning on to xiv. we find a poem apparently of 32 verses, but on examination we perceive (with Fischer and Postgate) that the last four of these ought to be the conclusion of another elegy, and that xiv. ends naturally at v. 28 with the inscription. Is this, or is it not, a parallel case to x., xi.? There too we seem to detect *the end* of an elegy in the six lone verses of xi., and that of an elegy which, judging by x. 7, 8, should *precede* the one it now follows. At the end of xviii. is a passage treating of false hair and paint, which Kuinoel and most succeeding scholars divide from the rest of the context. It is 16 lines long.

After v. 10 of xxii. Fontaine and Baehrens indicate a lacuna; after v. 42 all critical editors do the same. From point to point are 32 lines. From xxii. 43 to xxiv. 16, where Scaliger first marked a lacuna, are $32 + 16$ verses. There are three more isolated passages of 16 lines before elegy xxxii.: i.e. xxvii., xxviii. 47-62, xxxi. So far as our Book II. is concerned 16 seems a likely unit enough.

We turn on to III. xviii. and following poems. After xviii. 8 most scholars suppose a number of lines to have been lost, for Marcellus is nowhere named in the extant poem nor is his illness, to which our vv. 9, 10 refer. On our view the most probable explanation of some such loss is that a page has not been copied or a leaf has fallen out of the ancestor MS. Now after xx. 10 is an equally clear case of a lacuna: the wooing and the winning are two incidents, not one, as Scaliger pointed out. A page or leaf, on our view, has been omitted here. From xviii. 9 to xx. 10 are $26 + 28 + 10 = 64$ verses or 4 pages of 16 (I am not entering into all details here or anywhere, but giving the broad outlines).

Let us count on from this point to the end of the book. We have $20 + 34 + 42 + 24 + 38$ lines = 158, or two short of 160, 10 pages of 16. But after v. 36 of xxii. at least one couplet has fallen out of the catalogue of monsters, for *arboreasque cruces Sinis* (37) has no construction. (The suggestion is as old as Livineius.)

Supposing one couplet to have been lost since the time of our hypothetical MS., the last verse of our Book III. would fall at the bottom of a leaf, if xx. 10 and xviii. 8 were also bottom lines.

We soon find an indication of the same unit in Book IV.; for the verses of Elegy i. which Lachmann separated off, that is, 39-54, are 16 in number. It was my suggestion that they are in the style of the soothsayer; if that is so, they must have once stood in the text at some point later than the entry of that character at v. 71. Let us suppose these 16 verses to be a misplaced page copied too soon, and disregard it. I wish to concentrate the reader's attention upon the region from III. xxiv. 38 to iv. 1-70, and here bring this part of my argument to a climax.

In IV. i. 1-70, setting aside vv. 39-54, we have 38+16 verses (vv. 55-70); vv. 55-60 now follow immediately upon 38 (*lupam*). But after v. 60 we saw the probability that vv. 61-66 and 67-70 have been added by an editor who was grouping fragments of similar content, at the expense of vv. 71-74, which belong rather to the context of vv. 57-60. The last four of these alien verses *Roma jaue . . . to equus* are bound to belong to this last book, however, for nowhere else does he celebrate *cognomina prisca locorum*. And seeing that vv. 1-38 are full of such primitive names and of *sacra*, it is more natural that our future *canam* (69) should belong to a *preceding* poem, or to the beginning of this, than to any other part of the book. Verses 61-66, on the other hand, sound much more like the *Cynthia*. Umbria is not yet famous for its poet-son (*superbiat*). Yet, as we know, the *Cynthia* had an immediate success (II. vii. 18), *gloria ad hibernos lata Borysthenidas*. Tullus had been asking Propertius for information about his 'genus' and his 'Penates' during the composition of the *Cynthia*, and in our I. xxii. 1-10 the poet apparently sets out to satisfy this curiosity. All the answer given, however, is, 'If you know Perugia, I was born in neighbouring Umbria, where the spur joins the plain below' (9, 10). There is no exact explanation of *qualis et unde genus*. It seems at least a plausible working hypothesis that these six verses, having become separated from *Cynthia* xxii. by some accidental separation of leaves, were here inserted by an editor searching for a context. Let us see the effect of such an experiment as their removal upon our poem IV. i. 70. Omitting now not only vv. 39-54 but 61-66, we have $38+6+4=48$ verses, or 3 pages of 16; of which the first 38+6 (as far as v. 60) are consecutive, and to which vv. 71 and following seem to bear immediate relation.

Except then that we have a series of 48 lines instead of 32, this is a repetition of the circumstances noticed in II. x. xi. and II. xiv, where also a longer passage was followed by a short passage, which seems to have once formed the conclusion of a *preceding* elegy. In each case, if we are right in detecting leaves and pages, the first line of the series as we have it was the first of the longer group of lines. For if, as we have seen, III. xxiv. 38 can be the bottom line of a leaf, IV. i. can begin at the top of the next. If the reader will consider these three passages at his leisure, he will find, as I did, that only one supposition accounts for the state of the text, and that a very simple supposition. Since in II. x. Propertius says

scrip
the co
love-
xiv. 1
favou
ately
mispl
passa
being
section
the lo

(a) v
the t
when
simil
seem

verse
inser
are t
first
leaf
(p. 6
prom
with
they
with
Verr

refer
Achi
incip
a pro

regio
MS.
fully
this

page
will

scripta puella mea st, and in II. xi. is still saying good-bye, *place xi. before x.* as the conclusion of the once *preceding* elegy; since in xiv. 1-28 he is recording his love-victory and in 29-32 his vow of suicide should he lose, place 29-32 before xiv. 1 as the conclusion of the once *preceding* elegy; since IV. i. 67-70 he is asking favour for a Hesiodic book on Roman antiquities, place the four verses immediately before the present first verse of the book, as the conclusion of a preface now misplaced. In each the simplest explanation of the appearance of the short passage at the bottom instead of at the top of the leaf would be that, the context being lost with the loss of a leaf preceding, the scribe began his copy of the new section with the first verse of a poem, and deposited the torn fragment to the end of the leaf or section.

In our IV. i., then, I propose first to order the verses thus (in main outline): (a) vv. 67-70 (at the top of a new leaf), (b) 1-38, (c) 55-60, when 60 is the bottom of the third page; 67-70 were omitted and held in reserve till 60 had been copied, when (a page of the exemplar being finished) it was inserted as of seemingly similar content, and with it another torn fragment from another region which also seemed here to the point.

By now the reader suspects the *dénouement*. Between the present last verse of Book III. (last of a leaf of 32) and the leaves now following I propose to insert one whole misplaced leaf of 32 lines, hitherto called II. x. xi. Our II. xi. 1-6 are to be nothing but the last 6 verses of Book III.; and II. x. 1-26 are to be the first 26 of the preface to Book IV. This will be concluded at the top of the next leaf by the now misplaced verses IV. i. 67-70. Let us remember that, as we saw (p. 62) these 26 lines contain references to events later than Book III., and promise a Homeric strain (to which even the poems on Actium and Bactria, with the first, on the 'Fata Troiae et populi Romani,' hardly aspire); and that they view the *Cynthia* elegies as a thing long past and his own youth as written off with them. And then we perceive that the last couplet (here, I am told, Professor Verrall had anticipated me),

nondum etiam *Ascræos* norunt mea carmina fontes,
sed modo *Permessi* flumine lauit Amor,

refers to a literally Boeotian Helicon, to Ascræ of Hesiod as opposed to the new Achilles' Roman warfare; to this will now succeed the Roman Hesiod's incipient strain, 'I will sing of holy rites and days and antique names of places'—a promise fulfilled in six of the succeeding poems, our IV. i. ii. iv. vi. ix. x.

In order that my reader might visualize the proposed restoration of this region of the text, I hoped to print here as a plate the series of leaves of the ancestor MS. which would have been covered by it. But since the explanation cannot be fully given until the third section of this essay is set forth, I reserve comment at this point.

C. PROPERTIUS' SCHEMES OF COMPOSITION.

The results obtained by the theory of pagination, which enables us to restore pages, leaves, and groups of leaves in order as they stood in the ancestor MS., will be found to be startlingly exact, for almost nothing has been lost since that

ancestor's wreck was copied. In our Book II. it is probable that we possess *every verse* that still survived the wreck of *elegiarum libelli* I. and II. But fortunately there is a further test than the 16-lined page, by which junctures and fragments may be tried. Close study of Propertius at all points where the text is not in doubt reveals that he was a formalist, who composed each elegy on a numerical, that is, a musical, scheme of balance. Where our paginal reconstruction provides such numerical schemes intact, we have something like certainty that the reconstruction is true; where such schemes break off we have a fragment of a poem.

Let us examine the structure of a short poem, II. xii., very characteristic of his Alexandrian manner, where the text is hardly in doubt. It is not a Romanized, not even a Propertianized, poem: Cynthia is not named. The probabilities are that this is a close adaptation of a well-known model, perhaps by that shadow of a man, Philetas (v. 20). The writer stands before a picture of the boy Cupid, winged, quivered, and with barbed arrows ready in his hand. He is in flight over a sea of troubles. Between vv. 1 and 12 the allegory is interpreted for lovers in general; from v. 13 to v. 24 the writer cites his own particular case. Thus from 1-12 we have *amantes* (3), *iactamur* (7), *nostra* (8), *cernimus* (11), *nec quisquam* (12); but after 12 *in me* (13), *meo sanguine* (16), which shows that *nostro*, if sound, in 15 is loosely used for *meo*, *ego*, *mea* (20), *mea* (22). The point of view then shifts at v. 13, which in the words *puerilis imago* refers back to *puerum Amorem* in v. 1: his boyhood is not elsewhere remarked. The poem divides itself unmistakably at v. 12 into two equal sections—one general, one intimate.

There is further subdivision indicated. At vv. 7, 11, 15 the word *quoniam* is found next to the caesura; in v. 11 it occurs *before* the caesura, varying its fall in 7 and 15. Our ear then tells us that the stanzas of four are separate combinations; 5-8, 9-12, 13-16 are quatrains. There is left a quatrain at the beginning, and so we may be sure that the last 8 lines are thought of as two quatrains. But it is clear that vv. 9-12 hang closely upon 5-8; there is an *et* between: and similarly 21-24 hang closely upon 17-20, for *quam* takes up *umbra mea*.

We find a scheme then 4, 4+4: 4, 4+4; but besides the direct reference to v. 1 in v. 13 there is a subtle suggestion in this third *quoniam* quatrain of a counter-balance of the three interior fours against the first and the last two; and thus the two halves are doubly knit. We can go further: the internal balance of these six quatrains indicates yet a third correspondence, as subtly veiled.

The four central quatrains are each built up so that the first line corresponds to the fourth and the second to the third. Thus: (5) *uentosas alas* (wings to float with the breeze)=*non permanet aura* (8); (6) *humano corde uolare*, the god flutters in human frailty, as (7) lovers toss from crest to trough of the wave. [I fancy that Cupid is flying low over the sea, as Watts painted him, else we should have to take *undae* as *aeriae undae* (Lucr. 2. 152).] The incurable wound of 12 is inflicted by the *barb* of the arrows (9); the reason why we do not perceive that he is our enemy and are not on our guard (11) is that his quiver does not show from the front, it lies across *both* shoulders (10). The *assiduus* of 16 and the *bella*

answer the *tela* and the *manet*, *manet*, of 13. *Pennas perdidit* (14) = *euolat nusquam* (15). *Siccis habitare medullis* (17) is answered by *tenuis uapulat umbra* (20); *intactos templatere ueneno* (19) confirms the correction *alio traice tela* (not *bella*) above.

But the first and last quatrains *balance against one another*, couplet one against couplet four, and the second against the third. Thus the childish thoughtlessness of Love (3) might destroy (21) the singer of such music as this, which, light fancy though it be (22), is Love's own greatest glory, and so (4) would perish a great good for a light fancy (*levis* and *magnus* in each pentameter). But how exquisitely subtle is the contrast of the first and last couplets! For though *quicumque ille fuit, qui*, the nameless, immaterial painter, is answered not in 23 but in 21 by *quis erit, qui*?—ah, who but Philetas himself?—yet that intimate answer is carried on in *qui* of 23, and instead of the painted mute *boy* form of the generalized Hellenistic Eros which the first line conjures up, we end with the head and fingers and black eyes and twinkling ankles of the one *girl*, 'whose beauty made him speak that else was dumb.'

Thus yet a third combination of quatrains is disclosed: *a, b b b b, a*. The rhythms of the sense and the assonances of certain key-words stir the bright surface into a little sea of billowy curves when once the imagination of the reader has breathed upon them.

Further Examples of Numerical Scheme.

In *C.Q.* for April, 1917 (XI. p. 103), I have pointed out that our II. xxxiv. 67-94 constitutes a complete poem addressed to Virgil. The numerical scheme of it is particularly simple, for Virgil's ten *Eclogues* and four books of *Georgics* suggest to Propertius the numbers to use. He gives 10 verses to the former and 4 to the latter, and balances 10 + 4 with 4 + 10. Each group of 10 subdivides into 4 + 6: 67-70, 71-76, 85-88, 89-94. The *felix, felix* of 71, 73, bind those couplets and separate them from 67-70, as the *haec quoque* of 85, 87 bind those and separate them from *haec etiam, et modo, quin etiam* (89, 91, 93). *Tu canis* introduces the 10 and the 4; the end of the 10 is *ille laudatur* (76) and of the 4 *Cynthia*, and each of these is echoed in *Cynthia . . . laudata* (93). The numerical scheme of this poem is thus constructed:

$$\underbrace{4 + 6(4 \cdot 2)}_{10}, 4 \parallel \underbrace{4 + 6(4 \cdot 2)}_{10}, 4$$

An equally simple scheme to analyze is that of our II. xxvi. 1-20, which, like the last poem, is not divided off by the MSS. as a separate whole.

The scheme $6 + 4 \parallel 6 + 4$ can be further subdivided thus: $4 \cdot 2 + 4 \parallel 2 \cdot 4 + 4$, where the couplet on Helle corresponds to the quatrain on Glaucus, the couplet 11, 12, to the quatrain 1-4.

It will be observed that, if this view of elegiac structure be a true one, certain qualities of the lyric have been interwoven. We may be nearer to understanding Ovid's comment upon Callimachus: *quamuis ingenio non ualet, arte ualet*. We

will now take two poems, one from the *Cynthia*, our xiv., one from the *Liber Elegiarum tertius*, our xii., poems which are clearly marked off as complete by our MSS., and in which there is no question of lost couplets or derangement (though the second has one spurious pentameter).

Cynthia xiv., *tu licet abiectus*, has 24 verses like II. xii, above, but does not divide at v. 12. It divides naturally at vv. 8 and 16 into three stanzas. Within each stanza of eight there is an equally clear distinction between the first six and last two verses; the last couplets have the effect of a varied refrain.

- (a) non tamen ista meo ualeant contendere amori; (7, 8)
nescit Amor magnis cedere diuitiis.
- (b) nam quis diuitiis aduerso gaudet Amore? (15, 16)
nulla mihi tristi praemia sint Venere.
- (c) quae mihi dum placata aderit, non ulla uerebor (23, 24)
regna uel Alcinoi munera despicere.

Here 15 refers to 8, 23 to 16; but the last verse draws in the threads from stanzas two and one, *regna* referring specially to v. 13, *Alcinoi munera* to the gardens of 5 and the banquet of 1. If the reader will mark off these three stanzas of eight, each subdivided into six + two, he will readily perceive further artistry of balance within the groups of six. Since *tu* (1) is carried on to *miseris* (3) the arrangement of vv. 1-8 is in detail 4², 2; whereas 9-16 is shown by *siue, seu, and tum, tum* to be arranged as 2⁴, 2, which is also the form of vv. 17-24, since 17, 18 refer to hard spirits and 19-22 to soft.

The second and third stanzas are still closer assimilated by the break in each after the fifth line, i.e., after *reges* (13) and *cubili* (21). The many other details of design which must have so pleased a literary reader of the period do not affect the question of the numerical scheme and must be passed over here. It will be enough if it has been made evident that this poem does not merely consist of twelve couplets, but is built upon a numerically ordered pattern.

III. xii. *Postume, plorantem.*

The moral of this poem is summed up in its last couplet, which stands outside the scheme, as do the last couplets of e.g., *Cynthia* v., vii., viii^a, ix., xix. (three of which are introduced by *quare*). Verses 1-36 are thus built up. In 23-36 we have a passage of 14 verses cataloguing the delays and wanderings of the old Ulysses, which balance the first 14 on Postumus, the modern deserter of his wife. Dividing these equal groups of verses are eight contrasting Postumus with Galla, his light morals with her loyalty; they fall into two quatrains, 15-18, 19-22, and at v. 19 (*sed securus eas*) we begin the second half of the poem and the second subject of Ulysses and Penelope. The *munera* and *duritia* of 19, 20 refer back to vv. 1-6, particularly to 3 and 4. Each of the main groups—fourteen, eight, fourteen—has Postumus named in its first line (1, 15, 23); Galla is named twice (1, 15), and though Ulysses supplants her in v. 23, she has the *envoi* (37, 38) to herself.

* The groups of fourteen are to be subdivided like the group of eight. From

v. 24
verbs
line
another
ultim
verse
after
a new
trast
concl

[
C MS
person
reject
the Is

In
new m
angus
pagin
old st
able a
had ex
of Pro
strong
poem

T
plete v
are tw
R
Callim
eviden
overwe
Le
Book I
order g

¹ This
and Pro

v. 24 to v. 28 the adventures of Ulysses are described by *nouns*, from v. 29 to v. 36 by *verbs in the perfect infinitive*, all of which occupy the penultimate place in the line. (Verse 30 is spurious, as has been perceived by others; it should give us another adventure, probably that of Aeolus, with a perfect infinitive in the penultimate place.) In this way the sound and the grammar mark off the six first verses from the latter eight. Turning to vv. 1-14 we find that they too divide after v. 6. Verses 5, 6 are a moralizing conclusion to vv. 1-4; *uaesane* (7) makes a new address to Postumus; *tu tamen* (7) and *illa quidem* (9), like *uaesane*, contrast the persons without naming them as they are named in 1-4. Verse 14 concludes with a moralization like 5, 6.

The whole poem then is to be resolved into a scheme of

$$\widehat{6:8}, \widehat{4\parallel 4}, \widehat{6:8}\parallel 2.$$

[I may note that in v. 7 the true reading is *intexta (lacerna)*, preserved by the C MSS.; cf. *textitur haec castris quarta lacerna tuis*, IV. iii. 18, of the same pair of persons. The phrase *Ciconum mons, Ismara Calpe* (25) means that the poet rejects the view that Ulysses went to Gibraltar itself, and finds a Calpe among the Ismarians.]

In the light even of this limited analysis we can perceive the possibility of new meaning in such allusions to his own art as Propertius makes in *incipi iam angusto uersus includere torno* (II. xxxiv. 43), in *cur tua praescripto senecta est pagina gyro* (III. iii. 21), or in *carminis interea nostri redeamus in orbem* (III. ii. 1, old style). The circle or wheel of his art brings the scheme round to its inevitable and measured end: it is perfectly balanced. But before me Robinson Ellis had expressed his belief in such numerical schemes underlying our damaged text of Propertius [Catullus, vol. I. pp. 221, 222], and moreover had detected the strongest piece of internal evidence. Vertumnus, at the close of a now disordered poem (our IV. ii. 57), says:

sex superant uersus (te, qui ad uadimonia curris,
non moror): *haec spatiis ultima creta meis.*

The understanding reader will know at this point that the scheme is incomplete without a group of eight verses to balance vv. 1-8 of the true text. These are two of them, *and six remain*.

Robinson Ellis also anticipated me in detecting the numerical scheme of Callimachus's *Bath of Pallas*, with its triads of tens and twelves. The other evidence which I shall hope later to call in support of this theory would altogether overweight the present essay.¹

Let us then finally apply the test to our reconstructed Preface to *Elegies*, Book IV.: that is, the verses now II. x. 1-26 and IV. i. 67-70, kept in the relative order given by the MSS. [See p. 69.] The subdivisions are in the main marked

¹ This part of my theory dates from 1908-9, upon a similar idea—but from a fundamentally different standpoint.

74 A RECONSTRUCTION OF THE TEXT OF PROPERTIUS

out for us by the repetition of the significant key-word *magnus*, with which he flatters his patron here as elsewhere (cf. *at magnus Caesar. Sed magnus Caesar in armis*, II. vii. 5). It occurs in vv. 6, 12, 20, 21. We are limited further by the quatrain 21-24, after which the subject of Hesiod enters to balance Homer in vv. 1-6. Another quatrain must balance this in the first part of the poem.

The scheme then works itself out thus :

6	to the first <i>magnus</i> : subject Homer (<i>Haemonio equo</i>)
(= 10) +	implies Achilles; <i>mei ducis</i> is the second Achilles).
4 = 7-10:	farewell to works of love.
—	
2 = 11, 12,	invocation to his powers, for an epic yet unwritten.
(= 10) + 6 = 13-18:	the address and central subject, Augustus and his triumphs.
2 = 19-20:	the promise and the prayer. This single couplet balancing the former (11, 12), enhances the effect of the central passage; each has <i>magnus</i> in the pentameter to give it weight and distinction.
—	
4 = 21-24,	the abasement (at the fall of the poem's curve).
(= 10) +	
6 = 25, 26,	IV. i. 67-70. Hesiod is more within his powers; the six verses balance the first six on Homeric themes. <i>Meus equus</i> (70), Heliconian Pegasus, can scarcely soar with toil to the lowlier themes of the last book, with its archaeology and aetiology. Achilles' horses (2) are too swift as yet.

10, 10, 10, subdivided into 6:4, 2:6:2, 4:6, is a well-balanced scheme, in which Augustus occupies the central verse (15), and Rome, the chief subject of Book IV., the last stanza of its prologue.

I ask readers who have patiently followed the threads of this essay to forgive the absence of illustrative pages of my text, and to communicate to me such adverse criticisms as may occur to them. Little by little wise counsellors may help me nearer to the truth; and perhaps I may say, with less guile than Tarpeia,

cras, ut rumor ait, tota purgabitur urbe.

O. L. RICHMOND.

[The Editors regret that they are unable to arrange, at any rate in the present issue, for the appearance of the illustrative pages desired by the writer.]

EURYNOME AND EURYCLEIA IN THE *ODYSSEY*.

BERGK in his *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*, Vol. I., pp. 708, 709, 710, 715, and elsewhere, rejected all verses in the *Odyssey* where reference is made to Eurynome, a servant or attendant in the palace of Odysseus. His comments on p. 715 concerning the first verses of the twentieth book are typical: 'Right at the beginning of this book the appearance of Eurynome shows the activity of the imitator. This very passage proves beyond a doubt that Eurynome had no part in the original poem, and that a later bard arbitrarily used her name instead of the name of Eurycleia, who was the true female attendant in the old form of the *Odyssey*.'

This opinion has been accepted by practically all those who do not regard the poem as the work of a single author. Hennings, in those parts of his *Odyssee* where he comments on the various verses referring to Eurynome, has uniformly regarded them as later additions. Professor Ludwig Adam in a book, *Der Aufbau der Odyssee durch Homer*, Wiesbaden, 1911, sums up the arguments and collects the literature, and he is so convinced that Eurynome had no part in the original form of the *Odyssey* that he devotes an entire chapter to that subject, using the assumption of the spuriousness of this character as one of the main props for his theory in regard to the composition of the poem.

The argument of Bergk and his followers is that Eurycleia alone is needed, that she is all-sufficient as the head of the servants and as guide in the household, while Eurynome is simply a poor and transparent copy of the faithful and trusted Eurycleia, and that she was added by a late and incompetent bard.

A careful study of the *Odyssey* will show whether Eurycleia was indeed all-sufficient, and also whether just such a character as Eurynome was necessary in the palace of Odysseus, and therefore necessary in the *Odyssey*.

Eurycleia was a woman of great age, for she was a trusted member of the family of Laertes before the birth of Odysseus, since it was she who put the newborn babe on the knees of its grandfather and suggested that the child be named Polyaretus, Πολυάρητος, τ 404; but the hint was not taken by Autolycus, who had already decided to name the boy Odysseus.

The evident confidence reposed in her on that occasion would show that even then she was a mature and experienced woman, and that occasion could hardly have been less than fifty years before the events with which she is connected in the story of the return of Odysseus.

When a son is born to Odysseus he is trusted to the same nurse who cared for his own infancy. Eurycleia is peculiarly the nurse and attendant of Telemachus in the story of the *Odyssey*. Penelope, as Homer tells us χ 427, had not allowed the young man to give orders to the servants, and he never gives them; but Telemachus felt free to command his old nurse, which he does constantly, but he never gives commands to a single other woman servant in the house of his father.

Eurycleia α 428 carried for him the torches which lighted his chamber, and she also prepared his bed for him. She simply continued for the grown-up lad the tasks she had assumed in his infancy, and their relations have scarcely changed. She prepared for him β 345 the wine and provisions which were to be used on his seemingly distant voyage. We can hardly believe that Eurycleia could have made these preparations without long absence from the presence of Penelope, and yet there is nothing to show that this absence was noticed by the queen or her suspicions aroused, neither does Eurycleia show any anxiety lest the queen should miss her.

When the distracted mother definitely learns from another that her son had gone from Ithaca, Eurycleia tells her that she had assisted his going, but had been bound to keep it as a secret, thus proving that the bonds between Penelope and Eurycleia were less strong and less intimate than those between Eurycleia and Telemachus. The very fact that Eurycleia kept from Penelope this important secret shows that they were not especially intimate.

Eurycleia does not reappear until ρ 31, when she was much the first to catch sight of the returning Telemachus, while Penelope does not see her son until after he has been greeted by his nurse. Here, too, we see that Eurycleia was not a close companion of the queen, and that they were in different parts of the palace. Every reference to Eurycleia shows that she was in no sense a constant or necessary companion of Penelope.

Telemachus τ 16 orders Eurycleia to restrain the women within the halls while he stores away the weapons of his father, and here also the absence of the old nurse seems to have been unnoticed by Penelope. Telemachus impatiently takes Eurycleia to task for the assumed neglect of the beggar, Odysseus, ν 130, he orders her to bolt fast the doors ϕ 380, and to come into the presence of the victorious Odysseus χ 395, while Odysseus himself orders her to bring the women before him and to prepare a purifying fire in the hall χ 410, 491.

Eurycleia is plainly the especial servant of Telemachus and of Odysseus, since she is the only woman servant to whom the son gives orders, while even the commands of the father while he is in the palace are restricted to her. Only twice in the entire poem does Penelope give orders to Eurycleia, once when on the suggestion of Odysseus she is bidden to wash the beggar's feet, and again where Penelope tells her to prepare her husband's bed τ 357, ψ 177. In neither case does she tell her to do anything for her, so that although she gives the commands they are really for the sake of Odysseus.

When the suitors are slain and the guilty servants punished Odysseus tells

Eurycleia faithful before t

Th twenty house, a taught

Ev must as person s vital a n would r had bee came as indeed

We and we merely, standing Odysseus

She with he shared their ma so that elsewhere been tal to belie

Th Penelop the nurs of her c on the Euryno

Just servants initiativ did not the pala his voy part of knew th Per

Eurycleia to go and call Penelope. It is to be noticed that she tells the other faithful women first who rushed from their rooms to greet their returning lord before the nurse came into the presence of Penelope χ 496.

The number of women servants in the palace of Odysseus was very great: twenty went to the spring for water ν 148, while many remained at work in the house, and Eurycleia herself says there are fifty women servants whom we have taught to serve χ 421. Evidently Eurycleia is not included in this number.

Even if Homer had named no other female attendant than Eurycleia we must assume that the queen had some servant, some companion of her own, some person so close to her that she would not have kept from her for several days so vital a matter as the departure of her only son; and we are certain that Penelope would not have contented herself with an old woman, however deserving, who had been a member of this same household a full generation before she herself came as a youthful bride. Penelope's twenty years would have been miserable indeed if she had had no closer companion than Eurycleia!

We know that her father sent along with her the male servant, Dolius, δ 735, and we feel certain that women attendants were indispensable, not servants merely, but a woman capable of being both her friend and companion, a woman standing in somewhat the same relations with her that Eurycleia stood with both Odysseus and Telemachus.

She had just such a companion in Actoris ψ 228, whom her father had sent with her when she first came to Ithaca, and who alone of the household had shared with Penelope and Odysseus the knowledge of the secret which concerned their marriage bed. The name Actoris is found in no other verse of the *Odyssey*,¹ so that we must assume either that Actoris is a patronymic and that she appears elsewhere under her own name, or that Actoris herself is dead² and her place has been taken by another. It is impossible to decide in this matter, but I am inclined to believe that Actoris is a patronymic and that her own name is Eurynome.

The thesis which I wish to establish is this: Homer could not have made Penelope rely solely or chiefly on the companionship of a woman who had been the nurse of her husband in his infancy, but must have created for her a companion of her own, a companion whose connection with the household did not depend on the choice of Laertes or of Laertes' son, and that such a companion was Eurynome, whether Eurynome was the name of Actoris or of a successor.

Just as Telemachus confined his commands to Eurycleia alone of the woman servants or attendants, so Penelope, when giving orders for herself or on her own initiative, gives orders to none but Eurynome. Eurycleia, as already shown, did not keep close to Penelope, since she put the young man to bed in a part of the palace remote from his mother; she spent a long time in preparing things for his voyage without the knowledge or suspicions of the queen, and was in another part of the palace when he returned, so that she greeted him before his mother knew that he had come.

Penelope was seated in her own chamber when she hears of the insults heaped

¹ So Ebeling in *Lexicon Homericum*.

² Suggested by Cauer in note to ψ 228.

upon the beggar, Odysseus, and she prays that Apollo may at once destroy Antinous, who is the chief offender. Eurynome immediately replies, 'If answers could come to all your prayers, no one of them would live until the coming dawn.' Penelope answers, 'Nurse, they all are hateful to me since their hearts are set on evil' (ρ 494 sqq.) This first appearance of Eurynome shows a characteristic and peculiar intimacy with the queen. When later Penelope conceives the coquettish notion of appearing before the suitors to arouse their affections and their admiration it is to her intimate companion, Eurynome, that she reveals her intentions ο 164; and Eurynome replies with suggestions that could come only from the closest companionship, advising her to paint her cheeks and to adorn herself with alluring devices. Eurynome then summoned the two attendants Autonoe and Hippodameia, who seem to have regularly accompanied the queen when she appeared in the great hall. These women were evidently youthful, since Eurynome is here referred to as γρηῡς, while when she is with Eurycleia ψ 292 it is the latter who is given that epithet. There is no confusion here, since 'old' is purely a relative term; I do not seem old to my mother, yet I do to my son. Eurynome was doubtless old when compared with the handmaidens of Penelope, but young when compared with Eurycleia.

Penelope ordered Eurynome τ 98 to bring a chair with covering for the beggar, Odysseus. When the queen retires with her maidens for the night τ 599 she bids Odysseus to remain in the palace, telling him that he might sleep on the floor or the servants will prepare him a bed. Odysseus spreads on the floor the hide of an ox and draws over himself the skins of sheep, while Eurynome throws him a coverlet υ 4.

When Penelope comes into the presence of her husband, after his great victory over the suitors, and cannot bring herself to believe that it is indeed he, Telemachus is highly indignant, but Odysseus suggests that perhaps his squalid and unkempt condition may be responsible for her failure to recognize him; thereupon Eurynome has him bathed and anointed, and finally when Penelope knows that her husband has returned, then *her* servant Eurynome and *his* servant Eurycleia prepare anew their marriage bed ψ 290.

His nurse, Eurycleia, retires, and Eurynome, the especial friend and guardian of the wife, conducts them once more to their former bridal chamber, just as in Becker's *Charikles* it was the mother of the bride who guided the youthful couple to their marriage bower, 'da geleitete Kleobule's Mutter das Paar in den stillen Thalamos.' This is quoted from the last sentence in the story of Becker's *Charikles*. Evidently in a somewhat remote way the rites of the former marriage are carried out in this scene in the *Odyssey*.

Conclusion.—Eurynome is never given a command except by Penelope, while Telemachus gives commands to Eurycleia alone of the woman servants. There is no confusion in the mind of the poet; Eurynome and Eurycleia are distinct and necessary actors in the poem. Eurycleia belonged to the household of Laertes a full generation before the arrival of Penelope. Eurynome, on the other hand, is connected with the *Odyssey* solely from the side of Penelope; she

was her
ful que
with h
peculia
belong
certain
sent al

NOR

IN
of M
why sh
On the
note w
or, in
should
situation
the obj
withou
his ow
resemb
this se
tradition
it is ha
In
agree
[second
οὔνεκα
assump
οὔνεκα
λόγων
χρυσος
connot
unnatu
appare
he is v
of con

was her necessary and intimate companion, and evidently accompanied the youthful queen when she came as a bride to Ithaca. It is beyond belief that in a palace with fifty or more women attendants the queen should have had no servant peculiarly her own, and that she was forced to rely on an old woman who had belonged to the palace of Laertes years before she herself was born. We are certain that a father who sent along with his daughter a manservant, Dolius, sent also the more necessary companion, a companion of her own sex.

JOHN A. SCOTT.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY,
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

NOTES ON EURIPIDES, *RHESVS* 252, 340.

IN 252 Mr. Porter excludes a reference to the proverb, but, if so, the introduction of *Μυσῶν* is pointless. 'Where is the ally who . . .?' we can understand, but why should the Mysians be singled out? I am afraid that this path leads nowhere. On the assumption that a reference to *Μυσῶν ἑσχατος* is intended, the object of my note was to maintain that *πρὸς Μυσῶν (ἐκτί)* means, 'he comes from Mysia who . . .', or, in other words, 'he is a *rara avis* who . . .'. No doubt it is a blot that a proverb should be quoted which in its literal application is out of touch with the dramatic situation. But lapses of this kind are so common in tragedy (Jebb on *Ai.* 1112), that the objection is less serious than it appears at first sight. Proverbs are employed without a thought of their origin; and, if the poet forgot that he was straying into his own century, it is no great wonder. The scholiast notes the anachronism, which resembles the description in the *Hecuba* (450) of the Peloponnese as *Δωρὶς αἶα*. Now, this scholium is no Byzantine paraphrase, but a relic of the best Alexandrian tradition. It is our only external aid towards the elucidation of a perplexity, and it is hazardous to reject its evidence for other than the most cogent reasons.

In regard to *οὐνεκα*, I regret that I failed to make myself clear. Those who agree with Mr. Porter seem to hold that *οὐνεκα*, like *κατά*, can mean 'according to' [*secundum nuntii verba*, Vater] as well as 'so far as concerns.' If that is so, of course *οὐνεκα* makes passable sense, but no parallel has yet been produced to justify the assumption. That is the first point which is at issue. I went on to argue that, if *οὐνεκα* is not the equivalent of *κατά*, the words *ὁ Πησος χρυσότευχης ἔστιν οὐνεκ' ἀγγέλου λόγων* are meaningless in this context, but that with the substitution of *ἀμάχητος* for *χρυσότευχης* they would be intelligible. To force *χρυσότευχης ὦν* into a larger connotation—that is to say, to make it an expression of blame—seems to me unnatural. Mr. Porter, who thinks that 'Hector is pleased to be sarcastic,' apparently accepts *χρυσότευχης ὦν* as derogatory in intention. No one can prove that he is wrong; but that I am not alone in suspecting a corruption is shown by the list of conjectures in Wecklein.

A. C. PEARSON.

THE TRAGEDY OF ELECTRA, ACCORDING TO SOPHOCLES.

THERE is a note of uneasiness in many modern appreciations of Sophocles, and particularly of his *Electra*. A symptom is the familiar apology that, after all, he was the perfect artist. Jebb himself betrays a certain moral discomfort in the midst of his enthusiasm for the brightness of the morning sun that greets the righteous avenger. Professor Murray has the courage to state as a challenge the criticism which less candid writers hint by innuendo. By the very frankness of his indictment he helps us to face, instead of shirking, the issue. Unlike Euripides and Aeschylus, he says, Sophocles takes the story exactly as he finds it :

He knows that those ancient chiefs did not trouble about their consciences : they killed in the fine old ruthless way.

And again :

The 'stern and artificial' period is best represented by the *Electra*. The *Electra* is 'artificial' in a good sense, through its skill of plot, its clear characterization, its uniform good writing. It is also artificial in a bad sense. For instance, in the messenger's speech, where all that is wanted is a false report of Orestes's death, the poet chooses to insert a brilliant, lengthy, and quite undramatic description of the Pythian games. It is also 'stern.' Aeschylus in the *Choephori* had felt vividly the horror of his plot. . . . In the *Electra* this element, the horror of matricide, is practically ignored. Electra has no qualms ; Orestes shows no signs of madness ; the climax is formed, not by the culminating horror, the matricide, but by the hardest bit of work, the slaying of Aegisthus ! Aeschylus had kept Electra and Clytaemnestra apart : here we see them freely in the hard unloveliness of their daily wrangles. Above all, in place of the cry of bewilderment that closes the *Choephori* . . . the *Electra* closes with an expression of entire satisfaction. It is this spirit that makes the *Electra*, brilliant as it is, so typically uncharming.

This indictment is not to be met by the plea that Sophocles was a perfect artist in words. The 'uniform good writing' is admitted. It may be remarked in passing that Mr. Murray's epithets 'stern and artificial' are a translation of the words *πικρὸν καὶ κατὰτεχρον*, used, according to Plutarch's well-known story, by Sophocles himself of the second period of his development. It may be doubted whether in point of style the *Electra* does not rather belong to the third stage, when Sophocles has discovered 'that form of expression which

THE

contain
seems
much
πικρὸν
period
of 'er
undra
'techn

T
Sopho
admit
with a
has sa
untrue
possib

T
which
suffere
believ
scenes

T
sorrow
ciently
recur

B
that w
in a p
with a
prover

¹ *πικρὸν*
of this p
xlvi.). T
the bom
gency an
position,
which co
the best.
tradition
the obvi
school o
of antiqu
It is his
the Atti
μεγαλοπ
so in his
neither t
the ἀκρῆ
words w
between
Frogs of

THE TRAGEDY OF ELECTRA, ACCORDING TO SOPHOCLES 81

contains the highest degree of *ethos* and is best.' However that may be, it seems a pity to transfer the terms of a purely stylistic classification to the much more general problem of the types of drama. Whoever used the words *πικρὸν καὶ κατὰ τεχνον*¹ of the Sophoclean composition in a half-developed period of which we may or may not have specimens, was certainly not thinking of 'entire satisfaction' about matricide as evidence of *πικρότης*, or of 'quite undramatic' messengers' speeches as characteristic of the 'artificial' or 'technical' way of writing.

This criticism, however, does not affect the main issue. Is it true that Sophocles has 'practically ignored' the horror of matricide? If so, we must admit that he has been guilty of a sin against the tragic art. He has cloaked with a thin veil of beauty a story whose essence is an appalling tragedy. He has sacrificed the tragedy for the sake of a *tour de force*. I believe that this is untrue. But Professor Murray does good service in forcing us to face the possibility.

The key to the riddle will, I believe, be found in the deliberate care with which the poet has distinguished between Electra, the heroine and the tragic sufferer, and Orestes, whose prime business is to act. For the audience I believe it is at most a half truth that Electra 'has no qualms.' The opening scenes of the play give us the right perspective for the later development.

The romantic suggestion of the breaking of a happy dawn after a night of sorrow (17-19) has been sufficiently admired. It has not perhaps been sufficiently emphasized that these lines are a skilful adaptation of the theme recurrent in the *Choephoroi*, light out of darkness, sorrow leading to joy.²

But there is also more dramatic value in this description of the sunshine that wakes the dawn-song of the birds than is commonly supposed. It occurs in a paragraph which is carefully constructed, beginning and ending as it does with an exhortation to immediate action. Now dawn, in Greek poetry, proverbially awakes the birds to song and men to work.³ The picturesque

¹ *πικρὸν* for *ἀσθητὸν* is evidence for the antiquity of this piece of criticism (v. Jebb, *Trach.* Int. p. xlv.). The meaning is: 'After I had played out the bombast of Aeschylus, and then the pungency and artificiality of my own style of composition, I discovered the form of expression which contains the highest degree of *Ethos* and is the best.' That is no commonplace of the critical tradition. The ancient *Life of Sophocles* makes the obvious remark that he learnt tragedy in the school of Aeschylus, and gives the normal view of antiquity when it says that 'he is called ἡδύς.' It is his sweetness that earns him the name of the Attic bee. He has *ἡδονὴν θαυμαστὴν καὶ μεγαλοπρέπειαν*. Just as in life he was *εὐκόλος*, so in his style. Dio Chrysostom says that he had neither the *αὐθαδὲς καὶ ἀπλοὺς* of Aeschylus, nor the *ἀκριβὲς καὶ δριμύ καὶ πολιτικὸν* of Euripides, words which sufficiently indicate the relation between the normal stylistic criticism and the *Frogs* of Aristophanes. Dionysius Halicarnensis

and others admit that he sometimes falls into *ἀνωμαλία*, but no one, when once the traditional criticisms were fixed, was likely to suggest that the blessed Sophocles had at any stage been *πικρὸς* or *ἀσθητὸς*. Pindar, Aeschylus, Thucydides, are 'austere.' Euripides and Isocrates are 'smooth.' But Sophocles, like Homer, has the perfect style, 'harmoniously blended,' *εὐκρατον*. Dion. Hal. *de verb. comp.* XXI-XXIV.

² Cf. Walter Headlam's note in *C.R.* vol. XVII. 1903, p. 248. It should also be remarked that there are, in accordance with the normal stylistic method of Sophocles, verbal reminiscences of Homer *Il.* VIII. 485, and that line 19 significantly recalls Aesch. *Ag.* 276.

³ See Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 577 sqq. and 568 sqq.; Ibycus. *fr.* 7; Eur. *Phaethon fr.* 773, 23 sqq., recalling Hom. *Od.* XIX. 522, *Rhesus* 546 sqq., Callim. *Hecale fr.* in *C.R.* vol. VII p. 429, Xenophon *Oec.* V. 4.

description of the morning, therefore, is not merely suggestive of a cheerful and a hopeful atmosphere, but also of the strenuous call to action—*οὐκέτ' ὀκνεῖν καιρὸς, ἀλλ' ἔργων ἀκμή*.

The notion that the long expected moment of heroic action has arrived inspires the whole speech of the Paidagogos. Very skilfully it touches just those motives which explain the spirit in which Orestes, the typical liberator, welcomes his task. He is the son of a great general, and he comes to fight for his father (1). To this end he has been trained by the old henchman (13-14), who has taken pains to fill his mind with thoughts of the greatness of his father and of the country whose throne he is now to claim from the usurpers. The reference to the mythical suffering of ancient Io has dramatic value. The daughter of the ancient king of Argos is a type whose parallel is found in the hero's sister (5, 12). Again, the reference to Apollo, slayer of the wolf, has value for Orestes, sent by Apollo himself to kill the wolf-adulterer, Aigisthos (cf. *Ag.* 1257). And is not Hera's famous temple significant for the punishment of those who have violated the most sacred ties of marriage? Mycenae is a city of much gold, and the house of the Pelopids a house of much slaughter (9-10). Orestes comes to claim his stolen fortune, and to avenge his father's murder. Here, it is true enough, the poet has deliberately avoided the suggestion of the horror of the matricide. He wants to make us feel the simplicity of the motives with which, in his exile, without knowledge of his mother, trained by his murdered father's servant, Orestes has grown to the age of fulfilment. That is the main purpose of the speech, and the whole is bound together by the repeated and rhythmical insistence on the fact that the time of action has at length arrived (*νῦν*, 2 . . . *τοσόνδ' ἐς ἡβης*, 14 . . . *νῦν οὖν*, 15 . . . *ἔργων ἀκμή*, 22). Look at lines 65-76, and notice how the themes of the Paidagogos are reiterated, and raised to a higher power.

So much for Orestes. Now turn to Electra. Her first words are a cry to 'the pure light of day'; but, for her, day is a witness and summons to fresh sorrow, not hope. Line 91 recalls line 19, with a poignant contrast. Next notice that for Electra's sorrow, as for the eager courage of Orestes, the motive is the thought of Agamemnon. But for her he is *τὸν δύστηνον ἐμὸν πατέρα* (94). For Orestes it is Electra who is *δύστηνος* (80): the repetition is not accidental. And for Electra, who knows the tragic history by personal experience, not, like Orestes, as a story of a distant event, the most tragic element is this: it was 'my own mother' (97) who, with her paramour, so brutally killed 'my own father' (94). That touch makes all the difference.

But we have not yet seen the full development of the poet's art. The dawn that calls Orestes to action rouses Electra to fresh grief. Proverbially the dawn awoke, not simply birds in general, but particularly the nightingale, the bird of lamentation. Therefore when, at line 107, Electra compares herself to the nightingale, we are listening not merely to a familiar piece of tragic similitude, but to a lyrical amplification of lines 17-19, turning the picturesque to tragedy. The reference is made and at once forgotten. But at

line 147 it is repeated, and this time with a new and important detail. The bird of sorrow is now also 'the messenger of Zeus,' and Zeus, we know, sends winter and spring, sorrow and joy (cf. Hes. *Op.* 568). Upon Zeus, the chorus tells her, she must throw her trust (175). To Zeus she herself cries for vengeance (209) in an appeal more lofty than her earlier cry for the aid of the nether powers (110 sqq.). Nor is it an accident that we hear again of the birds ('the wings of my shrill lamentation') in her final challenge to the universe for justice (242-250), when she declares that all human modesty and piety are at an end if the dead are to lie dead and the guilty to escape unpunished.

It is only by remembering that Sophocles had an audience to whom these light touches of reminiscence were eloquent that we can hope to judge his purpose aright. Let us see whether this lyrical prelude does not give us cause to reconsider the suggestion that Sophocles has burked the moral issue. We begin with a monody in which we realize how urgent is her imagination in renewing the memory of her father's death, and how, in her loneliness, she feels that her only means of saving her own decency is the constant renewal of her grief, the passionate invocation of vengeance on the sinners. The same quality which makes her speak of 'my own father' and of 'my own mother' makes her also pray for the return of 'my own brother' (117). Then comes the sympathetic chorus, and we notice in passing that the epithet *δυστηνος*, applied by Orestes to Electra, by Electra to Agamemnon, is now applied by the chorus, with a different effect, to Clytaemnestra (121). The chorus gently reproach Electra for yielding to excessive passionate grief, though they admit that there is cause to pray for the downfall of the guilty (123 sqq.). Electra answers that she knows and understands their sympathetic purpose, yet will not leave lamenting. The chorus urge the ancient doctrine that grief will not undo the evil of death, and that moderation has its place in sorrow as in all else. Electra's reply is that duty to her father makes it right for her to lament. The chorus then produce a second ancient consolation. 'You are not the only sufferer, they say. Chrysothemis, Iphianassa, and Orestes. . . . The name fires Electra. Her answer begins with a flash of indignation, but ends in despair. This brings from the chorus their strongest argument for moderation. Zeus is the overseer and master of events. To Him should be left the accomplishment, to Him and to Orestes and to the god who rules by Acheron. When Electra answers by describing for the first time her own personal suffering, it is the turn of the chorus to kindle into indignation. They lament the tragic home-coming and death of Agamemnon, and Electra, stirred again by the memory, passes from lamentation to a violent imprecation on the murderers.

We have in fact come full compass and stand once more where we stood at the outset. Electra is pouring out her indignation and her sorrow. The chorus preach again the doctrine of restraint (213 sqq.). Electra's answer is important for our enquiry:

δεινοῖς ἡναγκάσθην, δεινοῖς ·
 ἔξοιδ', οὐ λάθει μ' ὀργά.
 ἀλλ' ἐν γὰρ δεινοῖς οὐ σχήσω
 ταύτας ἄτας,
 ὄφρα με βίος ἔχῃ.

The chorus urge *μετρίότης*. Electra's answer (245-250) is that, in this tragic situation, *αἰδώς* and *εὐσέβεια* are lost if Vengeance, which in her own way she keeps alive by grieving, is forgotten. The important point to notice is that Electra 'knows' all about the doctrine of moderation. She knows, but for her there is a necessity (*ἀνάγκη*) that overrules the natural propriety which bids men in most griefs to refrain from 'adding sorrow to sorrow.' That it is the poet's first object to drive home this point, not merely to enlist our sympathy by a pathetic piece of singing, is proved by the fact that the iambic dialogue repeats the theme. Electra feels the excessive passion of her behaviour (254), but there is a constraint upon her greater than the constraint of ordinary proprieties (257). As she develops her defence, it is no accident that the head and forefront of her sorrow is this (262):

τὰ μητρὸς ἧ μ' ἐγείνατο
 ἔχθιστα συμβέβηκε.

Electra, who so passionately loves her father, is not 'without qualms' at the sense of her tragic estrangement from her mother. The speech passes through hatred of Aegisthos, as usurper (267), murderer, and adulterer (273), to bitterness against her mother. The end is exactly parallel to the end of the lyrical dialogue:

ἐν οὖν τοιούτοις οὔτε σωφρονεῖν, φίλαι,
 οὔτ' εὐσεβεῖν πάρεστιν. ἀλλ' ἐν τοι κακοῖς
 πολλή 'στ' ἀνάγκη κἀπιτηδεύειν κακά.

We have already noticed that Sophocles recalls the themes already used by Aeschylus. In the *Choëphoroi*¹ Electra prays for the return of Orestes, and adds:

αὐτῇ τ' ἐμοὶ δὸς σωφρονεστέραν πολὺ
 μητρὸς γενέσθαι, χεῖρά τ' εὐσεβεστέραν.

Sophocles replies that, in the circumstances, it is impossible. This is the poet's way of stating the moral issue. It is stated in the language of ancient Greek, not of modern, morality. As Simonides said:

ἄνδρα δ' οὐκ ἔστι μὴ οὐ κακὸν ἔμμεναι,
 ὃν ἀμάχανος συμφορὰ καθέλῃ.
 . . . ἀνάγκη δ' οὐδὲ θεοὶ μάχονται.

That is the fundamental doctrine of the tragedies of Sophocles. It is the method of Sophocles to state the moral issue at the outset (cf. the early scenes of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, where the Teiresias scene stresses the limitation

¹ Line 141.

of human knowledge, the Creon scene the danger of despotic power). The issue thus stated, Chrysothemis appears, a living example of the 'moderation' which Electra rightly, though so tragically, rejects. Should not the pains with which the poet shows that Electra is sensible of her separation from the normal conduct of instinctive womanly modesty make us careful before we pronounce judgment when her real tragedy comes to be enacted?

Electra, not less than the modern interpreter, realized 'the hard unloveliness of the daily wrangles' with Clytaemnestra. The poet shows us one of these wrangles, not because he is indifferent to its unloveliness, but to prepare us, who perceive how Electra suffers from it, for the tragedy that is coming. The moral preparation for the tragedy of Electra is consummated when, at line 616, after the stern indictment of her unnatural mother, she recalls for the last time her sense of the gulf which separates her from the modesty which she would, in other and happier circumstances, have valued more than many correct people:

εὖ νυν ἐπίστω τῶνδε μ' αἰσχύνῃν ἔχειν
 κεῖ μὴ δοκῶ σοί. μανθάνω δ' ὁθούνεκα
 ἔξωρα πρᾶσσω κούκ ἐμοὶ προσεικότα.
 ἀλλ', ἣ γὰρ ἐκ σοῦ δυσμένεια καὶ τὰ σὰ
 ἔργ' ἐξαναγκάζει με ταῦτα δρᾶν βίᾳ.

That is the climax of the moral prelude. We were justified in supposing that the earlier scenes had a moral as well as a poetical value. These words, in which Electra states her tragic relation to her mother, stand out with the more effect because we have been prepared for their significance. Line 100 (οἶδα τε . . .¹) leads up to line 221 (δεινοῖς ἠναγκάσθην . . . ἔξοιδ' . . .), and this to 244 sqq. (εἰ . . . μὴ παλιν δώσουσ' ἀντιφόνους δίκας, ἔρροι τ' ἂν αἰδώς, ἀπάντων τ' εὐσέβεια θνατῶν). Then, in 254, we have αἰσχύνομαι . . . βία ταῦτ' ἀναγκάζει με δρᾶν, and, in 307, the responsive ἐν οὖν τοιούτοις οὔτε σωφρονεῖν . . . οὔτ' εὐσεβεῖν πάρεστιν. ἀλλ' ἐν τοι κακοῖς πολλή 'στ' ἀνάγκη κάπιτηδεύειν κακά. The contrast with Chrysothemis develops this theme, and before the scene is ended Chrysothemis has been won over from her 'good sense' to at any rate a partial appreciation of the true εὐσέβεια and true σωφροσύνη (464-5) of Electra. Then, after the dialogue with her mother, Electra sums up the tragic situation in the lines quoted above, in which the words αἰσχύνῃν . . . μανθάνω . . . ἐξαναγκάζει are rich in reminiscence.

The audience of Sophocles does not need to be told that it is a terrible thing for a child to kill a mother. The care with which Sophocles has shown us the daughter's sense of the shame of her unhappy relation with her parent ought to make us sceptical when we are told that Electra simply 'has no qualms.'

Yes; but it is true that this same Electra, when the murder is actually happening, eggs on the avenger and shows no trace of tragic ruth. Exactly;

¹ The scholiast is right.

that is the tragedy. The first scenes show us that Electra is not an unnatural monster: yet she behaves at the crisis without qualms. The second part of the drama shows us how this comes to pass.

The Paidagogos has been severely handled for his lack of dramatic hustling. He ought, the critics say, to have contented himself with a brief report that Orestes was dead. Instead of this he delivers a 'quite undramatic' *rhesis* of considerable length and irrelevant detail. I think this is unfair to the old man, who seems to me to have taken no little trouble in concocting his story, and no little mischievous pleasure in telling it. So I should be inclined to expect, in view of the delightful irony with which, at his first appearance, he asks for the 'tyrannus' Aegisthus, and decides that Clytaemnestra is probably his wife because she looks like a 'tyrannus.' The compliment is double-edged.¹

However, he wastes no time before telling his great and important secret (673). Orestes is dead, and Electra is in despair, while Clytaemnestra clamours her delight and curiosity. Is it not natural that the old man should give her what she asks? There is malice in his promise 'I will tell it all' (680). The tale he tells makes Orestes, to each of the chief listeners, something more than he has ever been before. To Electra he is no longer simply the child she saved, and the vague deliverer for whose coming she has hoped against despair. He is a splendid heir of a royal father, worth all the longing and the love, deserving none of the reproaches which his delay had suggested, a hero, hailed by all Greece as a hero, and then, in the moment when he adds glory to Agamemnon and to Argos, suddenly dead. You will call this *rhesis* 'undramatic' only if you forget that Electra is listening to every word. And so is Clytaemnestra. When she heard the bare news that her son was dead she was glad, without a touch of sorrow. It is surely not an undramatic speech which makes her for a moment become a mother instead of a fiend. It is only for a moment, but it is enough to justify the old man's story.

When she recovers, it is to vent her hatred on Electra. But Electra's first thought is that Orestes, like Agamemnon, is insulted in death by Clytaemnestra. Electra has for years maintained the cause of Agamemnon against the insults of her mother, looking always to Orestes as the final helper. Had it not been for her faith in Orestes, she thinks she would have died (323). But now Orestes is dead, and she witnesses for him (792), as she has so long witnessed for Agamemnon. But she still has no thought that she herself may be the avenger. For her, she thinks, everything is over (796). Death is the only helper now (820 sqq.). She is stirred to action by the bitterness of soul with which she hears the raptures of Chrysothemis. But her first thought is to kill Aegisthus, not Clytaemnestra. Does the audience feel that this is simply because 'the general scheme of the play required that Aegisthus should be placed in the foreground as chief criminal'? After the dramatic prelude I cannot believe it. Simply, at this stage of her

¹ See my remarks in *Class. Quart.* January, 1917.

develop
We are
develop
isolated
chorus
motifs,
But the
vengean

Wh
the killing
of Elec
possesse
brother'
Electra
at the c
notice, v
is upon
resolve t
from pai
the first
line 1193
her ill-tr
And he
played s

The ans
In E
The mea
to Clyta
Orestes
lyrical so
bent on
It is his
self-contr
slave of
ἔσται τῷ
Paidagog
(1368), a
throw int
abandon
in the s
Lykeios.
The

development the thought of killing Clytaemnestra does not come to Electra. We are not yet ready for the tragedy, and the tragedy is not yet fully developed. Meanwhile Chrysothemis draws away once more. Electra is isolated, steeled to kill Aegisthus, and to suffer for it. The verdict of the chorus is surely, at this point, our own. Notice how they recall our old *motifs*, the nightingale (1076), *αἰσχύναι* (1083), τῇ Ζηνὸς εὐσεβείᾳ (1096). But the chorus, who are not daughters of Clytaemnestra, include her in the vengeance (1081).

When Orestes enters he asks at once for Aegisthus. For him, it is true, the killing of Clytaemnestra will be, as Jebb says, a *parergon*. But the lament of Electra culminates in the thought of death which, as we noticed, possessed her when she saw how Clytaemnestra received the news of her brother's fate. Lines 1153 sqq. are of great psychological importance. For Electra the final and supreme outrage is Clytaemnestra's 'frenzy of pleasure' at the death of him who had been for Electra the avenger. But now we notice, when it is not Electra's own action that is contemplated, the vengeance is upon the mother herself. But Electra does not now speak of her own resolve to kill Aegisthus. Her thought again is of the freedom of the dead from pain (1170). For the psychology of Orestes it is important to notice that the first really direct and vivid knowledge he receives of his mother comes at line 1193. He had imagined that his sister was unhappy. He had heard of her ill-treatment. But when he sees her he is shocked beyond his imagining. And he asks, in a phrase deliberately chosen by the poet, who has already played so much upon the theme of 'Ἀνάγκη,

τίς γάρ σ' ἀνάγκη τῇδε προτρέπει βροτῶν ;

The answer is μήτηρ καλεῖται . . .

In Electra, from the moment of recognition, there is a wonderful change. The measure of her sternness in the earlier scenes, both to Chrysothemis and to Clytaemnestra, was the measure of her love for Agamemnon. Her love for Orestes finds expression in a complete loss of self-control. In a passionate lyrical scene she pours out her happiness. She forgets all caution. Orestes, bent on his task and conscious of the risks, is only half aware of her emotion. It is his turn to say *ἔξοιδα . . . ἀλλ' . . .* (1251). When she regains her self-control, it is no longer the same Electra who speaks. It is the devoted slave of Orestes who is now her leader: *ὦδ' ὅπως καὶ σοὶ φίλον καὶ τοῦμὸν ἔσται τῇδ' (1301) . . . ἄρχ' αὐτὸς ὥς σοι θυμός (1319)*. The intervention of the Paidagogos, still harping on the theme of the prologue, *νῦν καιρὸς ἔρδειν* (1368), and the insistence of Orestes on action, not words (1371), combine to throw into relief the dramatic change in Electra, her passionate love, and her abandonment to Orestes. It is under the influence of that passion, and in the spirit caught from Orestes, that she makes her prayer to Apollo Lykeios.

The tragic value of the scene that follows depends on our realization of

all this. We cannot judge the effect of *παῖσον, εἰ σθένεις, διπλῆν* unless we have appreciated the full force of line 1411, *ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκ σέθεν ὀκτεῖρεθ' οὗτος*.

Electra is ruthless here. But it is tragic that she is so. Sophocles knows that his audience thrills to the tragic situation. He has no need to dwell on the fact that matricide is terrible. The audience knows it. The audience does not simply take the view of the chorus . . . *οὐδ' ἔχω ψέγειν*. Precisely because the horror of matricide is so appalling, it is tragic that Electra, thinking only of her brother and her father, does not at this supreme moment feel it. And Orestes, fresh from the killing, thinks first of Electra (1426), as Electra thinks of him.

The tragedy, I submit, is accomplished. The very coolness, the calculated cruelty with which Aegisthus is received and trapped, makes his death 'a *parergon*.' But Electra, when it comes to the killing, calls for haste. She wants to get the whole episode dismissed as if it were an episode. She wants Aegisthus to be despatched and put out of sight. She wants to forget, not Aegisthus, but all the past.

We know she cannot. After line 1490 she does not speak. But while Orestes makes his final moral, and while the chorus raise their song of triumph, Electra still stands before us a tragic, not, I venture to think, a cheerful spectator.

I venture to suggest that if, at the conclusion, the chorus had uttered a bewildered cry instead of a clear shout of triumph, our own realization of the tragedy would be less poignant. Electra has no qualms at the supreme moment of her tragedy? Well, she is a loving and a lovable person; her instincts are womanly. Is it not tragic that such a woman should be found crying *παῖσον, εἰ σθένεις, διπλῆν*? And, after all, does not *εἰ σθένεις* imply something more than is to be expressed by loud and complicated lyrical lamentations about her feelings at that dreadful moment?

J. T. SHEPPARD.

TH
unhappy
accident
of verse
Restorat
is neither
None of
A short a
intelligib
The
the *Pitho*
is a palae
sister MS
which un
in the Sa
other as
continuou
A num
Appendix
illegible fr
the Vatica
Nor i
literature t
of Latin p
of Phaedru
These are
These
ruptions in
supplied.
in PR nor
stamps as t

¹ For our kr
in the first inst
latins, vol. 2 (18

PHAEDRIANA.

I. CORRECTIONS OF THE TEXT.

THE fabulist Phaedrus, or Phaeder if that was his real name, was unhappy in his life, and ill-fortune pursued him after death. In addition to accidental corruption and the interpolation which this provoked, his five books of verse have suffered from disruption and partial conversion into prose. Restoration of the original, so far as that original is capable of being restored, is neither simple nor easy. The sources of the text are diverse and different. None of them can be trusted, but none on the other hand may be neglected. A short account of them is requisite in order to make what follows immediately intelligible.

The oldest and most important MS. for the bulk of the extant poems is the *Pithoeanus* (P), the property of the Marquis de Rosanbo, of which there is a palaeographical transcript edited by Ulysse Robert. Of the readings of a sister MS., destroyed by fire in 1774, there are reports by several witnesses which unhappily do not always agree. A small fraction of Book I. is preserved in the *Scheda Petri Danielis* (D). In it the verses are separated from each other as in N and V (below). But in P (as in the lost R) they are written continuously.

A number of the fables contained in PR and others not so contained, the *Appendix Perottina*, are extant in N, a MS. at Naples, now almost wholly illegible from damp, and therefore necessarily supplemented by V, a copy in the Vatican, first described and collated by Cardinal Mai.

Nor is this all. At some time or other after the decline of classical literature there came into being and popular currency a collection or collections of Latin prose fables, which included amongst others a number of the Fables of Phaedrus or portions of such Fables variously modified and transformed. These are the 'Fables of the Medieval Paraphrasts' as they are called.¹

These 'paraphrasts' furnish indications here and there by which corruptions in the direct tradition may be removed or gaps therein detected and supplied. But in addition they give a certain number of fables extant neither in PR nor in the MSS. of the *Appendix Perottina*, which internal testimony stamps as the work of Phaedrus, and which in some instances may be restored

¹ For our knowledge of these we are indebted in the first instance to L. Hervieux, *Les fabulistes latins*, vol. 2 (1893), and subsequently to G. Thiele,

Der illustrierte lateinische Aesop in der Handschrift des Ademar (1905) and *Der lateinische Aesop des Romulus* (1910).

without difficulty or improbability to their metrical form. For my present purpose, the improvement of the text of Phaedrus, this is all that need be said. It is admitted on all hands that certain vestiges and remnants of the truth as regards our author are preserved in these collections, for whose character and genesis the reader may consult the two works by G. Thiele, and especially *Der lateinische Aesop des Romulus*, already referred to.

It cannot be doubted that the text of the *Fables*, in the source or sources from which the authorities already specified have derived it, had been corrupted by incorporation of glosses and notes, whether marginal or interlinear, and by actual interpolation. Of the former we have examples at I. 22. 7, where after *deuores* the text of P has the intruding addition 'hic intellige soricem' (the late Latin equivalent of *murem*) 'esse generis masculini' after III. 1. 52, where 'frige(m) fuisse Aesopum' (a truncated comment) stood in the original of PR; after IV. 23. (24) 2 'expectatio quod ille pareret.' I. 28. 1 'homines humiles' P may be another case or a doublet arising from correction. An instructive example is found at I. 26. 4*, where the genuine *marmore* has been displaced by glosses *patena*, *scutella*, *catino* in PR and all the paraphrasts save one.¹

These glosses are sometimes revealed by irreconcilable divergences in or between our authorities, as in the last cited instance and at I. 15. 1, which PR give as 'In principatu commutando *ciuium saepius*,' where *ciuium* is merely a qualification of *pauperes* in the following line.² Other instances are I. 2. 28* *deus* PR, *Iupiter* or *altitonans* the 'paraphrasts.' Read *Tonans*. I. 21. 5* 'ad eum uenit' P, 'uenit ad eum' D, whereas the paraphrasts present 'uenit ad eum spumans' or the like, while *spumans* is supported by the reminiscence in Martial XI. 69. 1. The *ad eum* is not required; for *uenit* without it see Verg. *Ecl.* X. 19 and 24 in a similar situation. App. XXVI. 1* *uenatorem* N(?)V, *persecutorem* or *persequentem* the paraphrasts; read *persequentem* or *se sequentem*.

Sometimes the gloss may be detected by its senselessness. So 'sine mercede' IV. 2. 8, which should be *gratuito*, 'poetae' IV. Epil. (V. 5.) 9*, which is a misunderstanding of *cantores* and 'partes' in NV IV. 25. (26) 13. Sometimes the gloss has been fused with the genuine reading. So apparently at I. 5. 7*, where 'nominor' is partly a gloss on *cluo* and partly a corruption of *nomine hoc* (Bentley). The same may have happened at V. 1. 18, where Menander appears before Demetrius, 'unguento delibutus, uestitu fluens | ueniebat gressu delicato et languido.' This puts the tyrant in a fury, and he applies to the poet the opprobrious term *cinaedus* (15). But on learning who he is he changes round at once 'mutatis statim | "homo" inquit "fieri non potest formosior," according to the reading of all our texts. But the proper opposite to *cinaedus* is not *formosus* (*cinaedi* were often and no doubt usually claimed to be *formosi*) but *fortis*, or a synonym of *fortis*, as we

¹ See Havet's note *ad loc.* and Thiele's in *d. lat. Aesop*, No. XCIII., where the MS. evidence is given in full. Compare my remarks in the current volume of *Class. Phil.*, where also the

passages of Phaedrus, distinguished above and below by an appended asterisk, are discussed.

² *Saepius* (by the way) is to be construed not with *commutando* but with the following *mutant*.

see fr
'cinae
as it
(Mart
Corpus
'form
M. Ha
O
detect
is that
groups
textual
letters

I.
'sent<
II.
III. Ep
IV.
V.
noni <
At

An
consider
sordido
should b
had a c
to amen
tegebat a
from the
L. Muell
'<pu>pu
'<ca>ca
I cor
PR and
In V
meo | aud
alteration
grounded
more criti

¹ The tu
less probabl

see from Phaedrus himself, App. VIII. 19, '*fortem uirum*,' compare ib. 18 '*cinaedus habitu sed Mars uiribus*.' Phaedrus however would not use *fortior*, as it failed to give him one of his *doubles ententes* ['inprobi iocus Phaedri' (Martial); cf. III. 11. 5]. Hence I conjectured in the note to Dr. Gow's *Corpus* text that *neruosior* should be read, and I compared Catullus 67. 27. '*formosior*' would have come from an over-written '*fortior*.' *neruis*, if M. Havet's conjecture is right, is used in App. XI. 4 as a synonym of *uiribus*.

One of the most frequent causes of interpolation in MSS. is Loss when detected by a scribe or a reader or reviser; and of Loss a very common species is that arising from the proximity of similar letters or words or of similar groups of these (Homoigraphon). There is no lack of instances in the textual tradition of Phaedrus. I subjoin a few illustrations, enclosing omitted letters or words between the symbols <>:

I. 1. 7, '*quer<er>is*'; I. 8. 2, '*quoniam <in>dignos*'; I. 10. 8, '*sent<ent>iam*' P;

II. Prol. 9, '*interpone<re>*';

III. Prol. 52, '*Anacharsi<s> Scytha*'; III. 7. 3, '*oc<cu>currit*'; III. Epil. 8, '*nostrae <prae>mium*' P;

IV. 1. 4, '*circum <in>*'; IV. 7. 13, '*scele<re>*' P;

V. Prol. 2, '*reddi<di>*'; V. 7. 25, '*mo<do>reducto*'; V. 9. 4, '*ante hoc noui <tu> quam natus es*'.¹

At III. 15. 11 sq. P omits all from '*porro*' to '*<pro>fecisset*'.

An excellent restoration of M. Chauvin at App. III. 1 sq. is based on this consideration, '*Mercurium hospitio mulieres <uiduae> duae | illiberali et sordido receperant*.' The proper framing of the anecdote requires that it should be *stated* that neither of the women had a husband though one of them had a child. Other passages where this principle has been or may be applied to amend the text are II. 2. 3 sq. '*aetatis mediae quendam mulier non rudis | tegebat annos celans elegantia*,' '*te<ne>bat*' Prasch; '*tebat*' was filled up from the neighbouring *celans*,² IV. 18. (19) 5, '*maxim<e> explerent famem*' L. Mueller, *maxim-* was filled up to *maximam* PR. We may add III. 8. 9 sq.* '*<pu>pulum*' altered in PR from *pulum* to the facile '*filium*,' IV. 18. (19) 17* '*<ca>catus*,' PR '*<le>gatos*' from the context.

I conclude with a pair of examples which illustrate the infidelity of both PR and NV in respect of such alterations.

In V. 1. 15 sq. the PR tradition has '*quisnam cinaedus ille in conspectu meo | audet uenire?*' and NV offer the same, with however the very obvious alteration of *in conspectum meum*, which L. Mueller, notwithstanding his well-grounded distrust of Cardinal Perotti's work, has placed in the text. M. Havet, more critically, accepts the witness of PR, which convicts *uenire* of corruption.

¹ The *tu* is attested by a paraphrast. Some less probably insert it after '*quam*.'

² Just as at IV. 7. 16 '*infecit*' was changed to '*interfecit*' through the vicinity of '*caede*.'

For *uenire* however he takes the *uenari* of M. Chauvin—a conjecture sufficiently refuted by the inadequacy of the parallel adduced to support it. In IV. 5. 4 ‘*unam formosam et oculis uenantem uiros,*’ the sense intended is obtained by the addition to the verb of an accusative of the object and an ablative of the means. Neither is present here. The expression appropriate to the author and the subject has been divined by Dr. Gow, to wit ‘<ce>uere.’ When homoiographon had produced its effect by reducing this to *uere*, *uenire* was the obvious correction. In V. 3. 9 sqq. on the other hand the case is reversed, and editors have allowed a commonplace emendation in PR to blind them to the merits of the alternative in NV. Phaedrus wrote

sed *te*, contempti generis animal improbum,
quae delectaris bibere humanum sanguinem,
optem *carere* uel maiore incommodo.

For *carere* ‘to be rid of’ compare Ov. *Her.* VII. 47 sq. ‘exerces pretiosa odia et constantia magno, | si, dum *me careas*, est tibi uile mori,’ Seneca *Suasor.* 6. 23 ‘quod nihil in salutem eius aliud illi quam si *caruisset Antonio* placuit.’ The sense of *carere* is excellent and beyond the reach of amateur correction. But somewhere in the line of descent by which PR have come to us *re* was lost after *re*. And with *care* left standing by *te* both case and sense appeared to clamour for the *necare* which has found its way into all our texts.

I. 3. 5 sqq. (Thiele, No. XLV.)

deinde contemnens suos
immiscuit se pauonum formoso gregi.
illi impudenti pennas eripiunt aui
fugantque *rostris*. male mulcatus gragulus e.q.s.

The unmetrical verse 6 in this fable of the Daw with Borrowed Plumes has been amended in various ways. M. Havet’s *immiscet se* seems more likely than *se immiscuit* or *miscuit*. But to account for the *uit*, I would suggest *immiscet se ut* with a comma after *gregi*. For *ut* ‘when’ with the historic present cf. III. 10. 27 ‘*ut sentit tonsum, gladio pectus transigit.*’ The postponement of the conjunction *ut*, like that of other conjunctions, is common enough in Phaedrus.

In 8 the *rostris* of PR might pass without challenge but for the indications of the paraphrasts. ‘Ademar’, which generally, and in this place particularly keeps very close to the words of Phaedrus, presents ‘illi imprudenti pennas eripiunt aui, *efugantque miserum*. male mulcatus gragulus’ e.q.s. *miserum* is of course corrupt, but not a corruption of *rostris*. Of what it is a corruption the other paraphrasts may show. The MSS. included under Thiele’s *Gallic Recension* give in their expanded expression ‘illi ignoto et impudenti pennas uniuersi eripiunt, calcibus et *morsibus fatigant,*’ continuing ‘et grauiter maleque sauciatu redire timuit miser ad proprium suum genus,’ the Recension of W (the Wissemburg MS., now at Wolfenbüttel) has for the words in question ‘*morsibus autem laceratum atque semiuiuum fugauerunt.* male acceptus ille

garulus
‘calcibu
ille sauc
duplicat
which m
else than
and plur
used it h
I. 20

This
which no
that it sh
II. 1

The
killed, an
But no e
use for a
which see
tegus of
corpore ha
and that
<uisc>er
uiscere’
quotes ou
I. p. 550.
II. 7

garulus (i.e. graculus) dixit,' while the MSS. of Thiele's *Ancient Recension* have 'calcibusque ac morsibus fatigauerunt semiuivumque dimiserunt. tum grauitur ille sauciatus' e.q.s. A comparison of these variants shows that there was a duplicate reading in the medieval tradition, the *rostris* of PR and a lection to which *miserū* comes nearest in form and *morsibus* in sense. This can be nothing else than *morsu*. Phaedrus, it may be added, uses only the ablative singular and plural of *morsus* in three and one passages respectively. But whether he used it here is another matter.

I. 20. 3 sqq.

corium depressum in fluuio uiderunt canes :
id ut comesse extractum possent facilius
aquam coepere ebibere ; sed rupti prius
periere quam quod petierant contingerent.

This is the reading of D ; but between *prius* and *periere* PR add *ibi*, which needs accounting for. As the *id* of 4 can be dispensed with, I suggest that it should be replaced by *ibi*.

II. 1. 9 sq.

tunc diuiso tergore
siluas petiuit, homini ut accessum daret.

The Considerate Lion divides the carcase of the bullock that he has killed, and retires into the forest that the Good Traveller may take his share. But no example of *tergore* in this connexion is forthcoming. The nearest is its use for a 'flitch,' in Ovid *Met.* VIII. 649 ('sordida terga suis' has preceded), which seems to be a transformation due to confusion of *tergus* 'hide' and the *tegus* of older Latin (Plautus *Capt.* 902, etc.). And it is not surprising that *corpore* has been proposed. I think however that the sense needed is 'flesh' and that 'homoigraphon' has been at work here, and I conjecture 'tunc diuiso | <uisc>ere.' For the meaning and the number cf. e.g. Lucilius 475 'pane et uiscere' 'bread and meat,' Lucretius III. 719. It is noteworthy that Charisius quotes our phrase from Ovid, 'Ouidius singulariter uiscere diuiso.' Gr. L. (K.) I. p. 550. 18.

II. 7.

Muli grauati sarcinis ibant duo :
unus ferebat fiscos cum pecunia,
alter tumentes multo saccos hordeo.
ille, onere diues, celsa ceruice eminet,
clarumque collo iactat tintinnabulum ; 5
comes quieto sequitur et placido gradu.
subito latrones ex insidiis aduolant
interque caedem ferro mulum sauciant,
diripiunt nummos, neglegunt uile hordeum.
spoliatus igitur casus cum fleret suos, 10
'equidem' inquit alter 'me contemptum gaudeo :
nam nil a misi nec sum laesus uulnere.'

I have printed the whole of this fable and marked by spaced type the words most relevant to my present purpose, in order that the corruption in v. 8 may appear in the clearest light. There are two mules in the incident, and, as we expect from a workmanlike Latin writer, they are carefully distinguished in the narrative. The most careless reader of lines 2, 3, 4, 6, 10 (where *spoliatus* is the equivalent of a Greek participle with article prefixed, a common usage in Silver and poetical Latin) and 11 cannot doubt which of the two animals is meant. But in the verse which is the pivot of the whole action what do we find? Why, the wounded animal described as *mulum*, that is as 'a mule' or as 'the mule.' The first is senseless, and the second false; for 'the mule' could only mean the unassuming animal of the previous line. Throughout the apologue the mules regard their loads as their own possessions. Hence the *nil amisi* of the one mule, while the other is rich (*onere diues*) until he is 'robbed.' It surely needs no great perspicacity to divine that here too a gloss has ousted the original reading

mulum
interque caedem ditem ferro sauciant.

But most of our editors, vainly busied in extracting something from the corrupt alteration *trucidant* which P(R) offer for the *sauciant* of NV, have let the chief culprit go. The naïveté of the interpreter who thought it needful to explain that the 'rich one' was not a man but a mule would have delighted Cobet. He was a twin-brother of the author of the traditional text of Herodotus III. 32 init. in the description of Cambyses' match of a lion whelp and a puppy *νικωμένου δὲ τοῦ σκύλακος ἀδελφεὸν αὐτοῦ [ἄλλον σκύλακα!] ἀπορρήξαντα τὸν δεσμὸν παραγενέσθαι οἱ.*

III. Prol. 45 sqq.

suspicione si quis errabit sua,
et *rapiet* ad se quod erit commune omnium,
stulte nudabit animi conscientiam.
huic excusatum me uelim nihilo minus;
neque enim notare singulos mens est mihi,
uerum ipsam uitam et mores hominum ostendere. 50

Phaedrus desires to propitiate those who are angry with his fables because 'the cap fits.' It seems clear that the apodosis to *si* is contained in v. 48, not in 47, because otherwise there is no point in 'nihilo minus.' If so, then 'rapiet—nudabit' will be an asyndeton, for which there is no sufficient justification, as *nudabit* is not contrasted with *rapiet* but is a consequence from it. *rapiens* (*raپیs*) for *rapiet*, with a comma after 'conscientiam,' would be an easy improvement. The verbal forms are confused at II. 6. 11 (*uadens* V.) and II. 7. 4, 5.

III. 5. 10

compensus namque poenas persoluit cruce.

There is not the slightest fault to be found with this line as it appears in

PR. NV however have *soluit sceleris*, which may point to a variant version, to wit, *soluit facinoris*.

III. 15. (Thiele No. XXXIII.)

Inter capellas agno *ballanti* canis
'stulte' inquit 'erras; non est hic mater tua.'

Thus PR, *balanti* NV. But the paraphrasts (excluding Ademar and Wissemburg which do not give the fable) present 'inter capellas agno *uaganti* canis dixisse fertur,' except that one MS. has *ragienti*, which is conceivably meant for *uagienti*. Hence Salmasius and Prasch conjectured *palanti*, accepted by M. Havet. The word however is no more a synonym of *uagari* than English 'straggle' is of 'wander.' If *uaganti* and *bal(l)anti* are to be combined, their common original should be *oberranti*, the first letter having been lost through the homoiographon in 'agno.' The elision presents no difficulty in Phaedrus, cf. Havet § 26, also IV. 16. (17) 3 'feminae aequassent.' But the evidence is not absolutely decisive, and *balanti* is tolerable.

III. Epil. 11 sq.

et hoc minus *ueniet* ad me muneris
quo plus consumet temporis dilatio.

So PR, and upon this do the editors build. But *redibit* 'will duly come' seems to be the most appropriate verb; cf. IV. 26. 19 '*rediit* hora dicta' 'came in due course,' v. 8 'breuitati nostrae praemium ut *reddas* peto,' and at IV. 22. 7 NV have *redire*, while PR give *uenire*, upon which also correction is generally based. The corruption is found elsewhere in Latin MSS., e.g. at Hor. *Carm.* IV. 5. 31, *Epist.* II. 2. 22.

IV. 2. 3 sq.

sed diligenter intuere has nenias;
quantum *subtilis* utilitatem reperiens.

The Vulgate correction is *sub illis* (Pithou), of which M. Havet says 'post *has nefas*.' This statement is too strong, and his own correction *sub titulis*, though palaeographically plausible, does not provide a satisfactory expression. I submit as possible

quanta m <in> pusillis.

IV. 6. 1 sq.

cum uicti mures mustelarum exercitu
(historia *quorum* in tabernis pingitur).

The current emendation of the faulty metre is the *quorum et* of Heinsius and Bentley, with an *et* at best superfluous. M. Havet prefers the *quouis* of Dressler, to which, as indeed to *quorum* likewise, it may be objected that we should expect *quae*, and not a genitive of the relative. I propose *quot sunt*, that is, a story painted up in all the booths there are, a colloquial exaggeration recalling the similar turn in Catullus 47. 1 'adeste hendecasyllabi, *quot*

estis, | omnes undique,' and 49. 2. *quotsunt* might easily pass to *quorsum*, and from this to *quorum* was but a step.

IV. 17. (18.) 8

factus periculosus tum gubernator sophus.

So P, R apparently having *periculo sis* with a line (of junction over the *sis* ?). The vulgate *periclo*, Pithou's correction, leaves the *sis* unexplained, while Orelli's *periclis* does not account for the -os- and in addition gives us an inappropriate plural. The superfluity of syllables suggests the presence of a doublet, which receives some support from the indications in R. I suggest that *periculo sis* is for *periclo sic*, and that the *tum* should be struck out as an attempt at explanation or improvement.

Appendix XI. 9 sq.

*ferendus esses, arte si te diceris
superasse qui esset melior uiribus.*

The halting metre of v. 10 may be more easily set right than by M. Havet's insertion of *quam tu* before *qui*, or by the other devices which are recorded in his notes, if we read

superasse eum qui te esset melior uiribus.

In the previous line Halbertsma's *arte* for *forte* seems necessary.

Appendix XVI. 6 sq.

*postquam esurire coepit fera societas,
discerpsit dominum et fecit partes facinoris.*

V. 6 is unmetrical, *fera* having been drawn from its place by the attraction of its noun. It was put by L. Mueller, whom M. Havet follows, after *societas*. But it is more probable that it has come from the earlier part of the line, and should precede *esurire*.

In 7 I had conjectured *funeris* 'the corpse,' when I found this conjecture had already been made by M. L. Duvau and adopted in M. Havet's school edition (1916).

Appendix XXI. 7 sq.

*cum circumspectans errore haesisset diu
et perdidisset tempus aliquot milium.*

M. Havet rejects *errore*, the simple correction of V's *orrone*, on the double ground, as it would seem, of sense and of metre. So far as sense goes, nothing more appropriate than *error* could be found. It means 'bewilderment' 'perplexity,' as at III. 10. 41, IV. 5. 33; compare *errare* at Lucan VIII. 804 with my note. The metrical question is more difficult. This does appear to be the only place in Phaedrus where there is an elision in the caesura of a spondaic fourth foot, unless in App. VIII. 28 we read *hostile* for *hosti*, where the vulgate has *hostis* and M. Havet prints *histicum*, an emendation which his own comment refutes; cf. 'hostile corpus' I. 21. 8. If the metre bars *error(e)*,

we must then fall back on *error* with the Phaedrian use of the abstract. Instances like 'decepta auditas—dimisit cibum' I. 4. 5 sq. or 'nec hanc repulsam tua sentiret calamitas' I. 3. 16 (to quote only two) go far to justify 'circumspectans error haesisset.'

Appendix XXIV. 1 sqq. (Thiele, No. xcv.)

Odiosa cornix super ouem consederat,
quam dorso cum tulisset inuita et diu,
'hoc,' inquit, 'si dentato fecisses cani
poenas dedisses.

So PR. I have already, in a forthcoming paper (*Classical Philology*, vol. XIII., 1918), argued that 'inuita et diu' is unsound. With my change to *inuito* the PR reading becomes tolerable. But a little indication in the paraphrasts points to something quite different, which I will now submit as an alternative. It may be premised that the vulgate leaves us to conjecture what the *cornix* did to the sheep when it had perched on its back. But Ademar has 'oui cornix consederat tundens dorsum eius. hoc cum diu fecisset ait ouis cani temptationem hanc' (an attempt to make something of the corruption *temptato* (tentato) for *dentato*, as Thiele *ad loc.* has correctly divined) 'non ferres latratum eius' (a simple substitute for *poenas dedisses*). Now *tundere* (κρούειν) is the very word which Plautus uses for a bird's incessant pecking at *As.* 262 'sed quid hoc quod *picus ulmum tundit?* hau temerariumst,' and Ademar's 'hoc cum diu fecisset' means no more and no less than *tutudisset*, of which, when *tu* had fallen out before *tu*, the *tulisset* of PR would be an easy corruption, while *inuita et* is merely *inuita e* with a wrong division of the word and an exceedingly common corruption. Two other slight changes are required to restore the variant reading *quae dorsū* for *quā dorso*, and we obtain

quae dorsum cum tutudisset inuitae diu

Nauck, it may be added, as I learn from M. Havet's note, had already proposed *quae*; but with the vulgate this change does not seem to be necessary.

J. P. POSTGATE.

LIVERPOOL,
January 5, 1918.

(To be continued.)

RESTORATIONS AND EMENDATIONS IN LIVY VI.-X.

(Cf. *Classical Quarterly* IV. (1910), p. 267; V. p. 1.)

Continued.

BOOK IX.

IX. 6. 12. (The young nobles of Capua describe the bearing of the Romans released from the Caudine Forks after having passed under the yoke.)

iacere indolem illam Romanam ablatosque cum armis animos; non reddere salutem, non salutantibus dare responsum, non hiscere quemquam prae metu potuisse.

So *MPFUpOTDLA*, but *F²O* add a punct after *salutem*, and *TDA* write the following *non* with a capital; by this time (pp. 5 sq., 13, sup.) we know what these things suggest.

salutantibus dare responsum means nothing whatever more than *salutem reddere*, cf. e.g. 7. 5. 4 *salute accepta redditaque*, so also 3. 26. 9. Hence Madvig puts a comma and the *non* after *salutantibus*, which avoids the tautology more in appearance than reality and does not explain why the *non* was misplaced. The whole clause (*non . . . responsum*) should be deleted as a gloss, of unimpeachable veracity, to *non reddere salutem*.

IX. 9. 17. *Nihil ergo vobis nec nobiscum est quibus nihil mandastis nec cum Samnitibus cum quibus nihil egistis.*

So the clauses stand, rightly in *PFUpOT*. But in *DLA* the second member *nec cum . . . egistis* is completely lost. In *M* it is omitted, but our friendly *his* (p. 3 sup.) stands in its place, and far above in the margin *hā* introduced the omitted words. The corrector in *A* (*A²*) following *M* (as always) has been less careful; while giving the words correctly he indicates that they are to be inserted after *ergo vobis*. Now if we had only *DL* and the (uncorrected) *A* we should have lost half the sentence; if we had only *A²* we should have had the two *nec*-clauses, but in what, as it is, we know to be the wrong order. We commend this simple case, in which every step of the corruption is patent, to any reader who doubts the likelihood of such permutations.

IX. 11. 10. (The Samnite C. Pontius repudiates the surrender of Postumius.)

more
dis q

obluc
from
Book
A :
Jac.
con
hanc
con
to at
as C
and
phra

occu
our
10. 3
(190
verti
minu
inde
O in
obluc
F ha
conf

ex il
fortu
d u c
nom
perc
ullo

of du
the v
sent
letter

¹ Se
note.
² Se

Ego uero istos quos dedi simulatis nec accipio nec dedi arbitror nec moror quo minus in ciuitatem oblactam sponsione commissa iratis omnibus dis quorum eluditur numen redeant.

The curious form *oblactam* is given by *MP* (*obluctam* or *obuictam* *O*; *obluctam* *TDLA*; *oblitam* *Up*; *obligatam* *F*³; the -g- seems to have come from *F* himself), and by *Harl.* 2 (which Zingerle confounds¹ with the *H.* of Books I.-VIII.—an authority five hundred years older) and a late corrector in *A*: *obruptum* by *dett. aliq.* The best conjecture yet offered is that of *F*³, or *Jac. Gronov's obstrictam*; but why was either corrupted? We think that *conuictam* may be right in form as it is in meaning; cf. *Cic. de Dom.* § 145 *hanc ego deuotionem capitis mei, cum ero in meas sedes restitutus, tum denique conuictam et commissam putabo*. It is a much commoner construction to attach *conuictus* to the defaulter than to the pledge which he has taken as Cicero here does; if our conjecture be right, the combination of *conuictus* and *commissus* in both passages may suggest either that it was a standing phrase, or that Livy had Cicero's sentence in his mind.²

But how did *conuic-* become *obluc-*? By the use of a symbol whose occurrence in our Nicomachean archetype we have many times observed (see our note on 5. 43. 1, and add to its nine examples now further 9. 23. 12; 10. 31. 12; and perhaps 9. 15. 9), and which one of us [in *Class. Quart.* II. (1908), p. 210 footnote] proposed to call the *siglum Floriacense*—namely, a vertical instead of a horizontal line above a vowel to denote a nasal. In minuscule hand (and possibly in majuscule³) *cō* may easily be read as *ob-*; indeed it was the likeliest interpretation to a scribe unfamiliar with the siglum. *O* interpreted or rather copied the word as something between *obuictam* and *obluctam*, the rest did their best after their several manners. In 10. 46. 1 *F* has *cō-* for *ob-*; cf. also 29. 26. 7 and 29. 27. 6 where *con-* and *oc-* are twice confused; and 21. 8. 2 *obortum* in *A* for *coortum* in *CMD*.

IX. 18. 11. Miremur si cum ex hac parte saecula plura numerentur quam ex illa anni, plus in tam longo spatio quam in tredecim annorum aetate fortuna uariauerit? Quin tu hominis cum homine et ducis cum duce fortunam cum fortuna confers? Quot Romanos duces nominem quibus nunquam aduersa fortuna fuit? Paginas in annalibus . . . percurrere licet consulum dictatorumque quorum nec uirtutis nec fortunae ullo die populum Romanum paenituit.

So *PFU³OTDLA*, except that in the second sentence *F* has *duces* instead of *ducis* and *T* has *fortuna* instead of *fortunam*. Thanks to the occurrence of the word *fortuna* before *uariauerit* also, *M* has unluckily dropped out this sentence save the word *confers*. The missing words contain just fifty-four letters, and no doubt contained three lines of the uncial archetype; the

¹ See our Preface to Books I.-V., p. vi footnote.

² See Addendum I. on p. 104.

³ Where the *ð* commonly appears with a very small upper half.

line before them ended with *aetate fortuna*, and the last of the three lost was clearly *fortunam cum fortuna*.

The current method of dealing with the confusion is to excise *cum fortuna* as the addition of a stupid scribe—no doubt a possible hypothesis. So Madvig (anticipated, according to Zingerle, by Benedict). But this is to overlook a difficulty which Livy found quite serious, and which his correctors prudently neglect. Who is the *homo*, the *dux* on the Roman side who is to be compared with Alexander? In c. 16. 19 Livy carefully avoids making such a claim for Papirius, though he mentions, in passing, that others did so (*destinant*, not *destinare*). But, by neglecting this, the whole point of Livy's boyish yet still thoughtful *deliberatio*¹ is lost, and that though Livy himself expresses it quite clearly in the sentences immediately preceding and following this comparison and printed above. Granted that no one man was the equal of Alexander; but could the latter alone have met all the company of great commanders whom Rome could have sent against him in any series of years? *Quot Romanos duces* is Livy's argument; and it is surely absurd in face of this to make him speak as if he had some unique, but quite unnamed, general to set against Alexander.

As usual the MSS. themselves give us the clue. Read *duces* with *F* instead of *ducis*,² and alter *hominis* to *homines*, as Weissenborn suggested long ago. The *et* might perhaps go too, as being an attempt to introduce some balance into the sentence when once the accusatives had been corrupted into genitives. But it may be defended as coupling *homines* and *duces*, the more personal side (character and generalship) in contrast to the *fortuna* which, though a possession, was personal in a less degree, or at least in another way; indeed it may be that the presence of *et* here, but not before *fortunam*, was one of the factors which led to the change to the genitive, if it was a conscious change at all. The contrast between *fortuna* and *uirtus* appears in the next sentence, and is a strong reason against restricting the scope of the sentence under discussion to *fortuna* alone, as is done by the current text.

The sentence then becomes 'Quin tu homines cum homine, duces cum duce, fortunam cum fortuna confers?' But if anyone prefers to keep *et* before *duces* we shall not quarrel with him.

quantus maximus and *quantus maxime*.

IX. 24. 9 decurrit inde quanto maxime poterat cum tumultu 'ad arma' . . . clamitans.

IX. 10. 10 quanta maxime poterat ui perculit.

X. 40. 8 quanto maxime posset moto puluere³ ostendere.

XXI. 41. 4 regressus ad nauis quanta maxime potui celeritate tanto maris terrarumque circuitu.

XXIV. 35. 5 quantae maxime possent peditum equitumque copiae in Siciliam traicerentur.

¹ On the character of the digression in cc. 18, 19, see App. II. in Prof. Anderson's edition. Our own study confirms his conclusion.

² The confusion of *-is* and *-es* in any part of the third declension needs no illustration.

³ Or as we read *motu pulueris* *se*.

In all these five passages Madvig changes the adverb *maxime* of the MSS. to the adjective *maximo*, *maxima*, or *maximae*, on the authority of a note of Zumpt on Curtius 4. 34. 10 (= Drakenborch's citation 4. 8. 10) *quanta maxima celeritate potuit*. (We have omitted commas for reasons that will appear below.) Zumpt's note is possibly based on Drakenborch's notes on 7. 9. 8 and 9. 10. 10; in the former Drakenborch says 'uel etiam legi posset (sc. unless the MSS. were against it) *quanta* (instead of *quantum*) *maxima uoce potuit* : cuius locutionis ex Liuio plura exempla uide infra ad lib. IX. cap. x. § 10;' then giving some non-Livian passages, and amongst them the passage in Curtius *l.c.* he says 'ubi uidendi Acidal. et Freinshem. nec non doctiss. Snakenb.¹ ad Curtii lib. V. cap. ix. § 1. Adde etiam uiros doctos ad Quintil. Declam. CCCXXIII. pag. 653.' At the 9. 10. 10 passage Drakenborch, after saying that *quanta maxima ui poterat* would be possible (as in fact some later MSS. write instead of *poterat ui*), adds with his usual caution: 'quod non displiceret, si aut plures aut grauioris auctoritatis codices testimonio suo comprobarent. Liuus enim saepius ita locutus est.' These words of wisdom and caution are disregarded by Madvig, and with them the grauioris auctoritatis codices in favour of some codices deteriores (as so often, especially in the third Decade) and Zumpt's note on Curtius! Even the dett. sometimes fail to support him; and even if we grant it to be possible that in 24. 35. 5 Put. may have written *maxime* by mistake for *maximae*, it must be pointed out that *e* for *ae* is not so frequent in Put. as *ae* for *e*; also that Put. has written in this very sentence *quantae* and *copiae* correctly.

If we turn now to the examples of the adjectival agreement of *maximus* with the noun we find two slightly different types:²

(a) 10. 39. 9 (and 10. 41. 8) *quanta maxima ui posset* (possent).

26. 46. 3 *quanto maximo cursu poterant*.

27. 43. 12 *quantis maximis itineribus poterat ad collegam ducebat* [Put., but *poterat itineribus Pal. 3* (Luchs' V.) *αβγδε* with Gelenius, and therefore possibly Spirensis].

30. 25. 8 *quanto maximo impetu poterant*; to which may be added 7. 9. 8 *quantum maxima uoce potuit*.

(b) 10. 29. 9 *ut signo dato in transuersos quanto maximo possent impetu incurrerent*.

23. 16. 12 *quanto maximo possent impetu in hostem erumpere iubet*.

27. 43. 12 if the (possibly Spirensian) reading of Gelenius be adopted (see above).

24. 35. 5 if Madvig be right in changing *quantae maxime . . . copiae* of Put. to *quantae maximae . . . copiae*.

28. 1. 6 Silanus *quantis maximis poterat itineribus—impediebant autem et asperitates uiarum et angustiae saltibus crebris, ut*

¹ See Addendum II. on p. 104.

² See Addendum III. on p. 104.

pleraque Hispaniae sunt, inclusae—tamen non solum nuntios sed etiam famam aduentus sui praegressus, ducibus indidem ex Celtiberia transfugis ad hostem peruenit.

We find then that (1) most often the noun is next to *maximus*, and therefore clearly within the relative-clause, (2) less often it follows *possum*, and may be regarded as either within or outside the relative-clause according to 'the balance of the clauses' in the period. The principle is particularly clear in the example from Book XXVIII., thanks to the long parenthesis. Drakenborch, we think, agrees with this view, for he regularly puts the comma after the noun¹; from Madvig's commas we can hardly with certainty discover anything except 'the golden rule' that all relative-clauses must be always flanked with commas, so that in his text the noun is always² included between this pair of policemen, whether justly or not.

Applying this principle of 'the balance of the clauses' to the examples of *maxime*, we consider that at 9. 10. 10 *quanta maxime poterat ui perculit* the balance rather attaches *ui* to *perculit*; if with Drakenborch and Madvig we threw *ui* into the relative-clause, we feel that we should be inclined by our examples to write *maxima* with Madvig. At 9. 24. 9 Madvig (writing *maximo*) throws the *cum tumultu* into the relative-clause; Drakenborch punctuates thus: *decurrit inde, quanto . . . poterat, cum tumultu, ad arma*, etc. Here the order in relation to the *possum* is nearer type (b) above, but the noun is separated further from the *maximus* or *maxime* by the *cum*; also the main verb *decurrit* precedes the relative-clause, but part of the main clause follows after *cum tumultu*: it seems best not to obscure the manuscript evidence here. Not unlike this in the precession of the verb is 21. 41. 4 *regressus quanta maxime* (Put. is represented by CM) *potui celeritate*, but here the balance and sense require a pause or punctuation after *celeritate*, if not also a change of reading (with Madvig) to *maxima*. Finally at 24. 35. 5 Madvig punctuates thus: *quantae maxime* (but writes *maximae*) *possent, peditum equitumque copiae in Siciliam traicerentur*; here we should consider that either his reading or his punctuation must be wrong, and that as no pause is reasonably possible after *copiae*, which is the subject of the sentence followed directly by the predicate, we conclude that Put. is right and Madvig wrong in altering that text. We think therefore the evidence shows that (1) where the adverb *maxime* is used, the verb *possum* immediately follows it, separating the noun from the relative clause; (2) where the noun is indisputably included in the relative clause, the adjective *maximus* is used in agreement with it; (3) the adjective is also used when the noun follows *possum*, but that in the majority of cases it is thrown by the balance of the clauses into connexion with the words that precede it. So far therefore as the text is concerned we make no alterations³ in the readings of the MSS.

¹ See Addendum IV. on p. 105.

² There is an exception in 37. 59. 1.

³ See Addendum V. on p. 105.

IX. 40. 3. This part of the chapter describes the splendid armour of two Samnite armies, one with gilded, one with silvered shields. It concludes thus:

Tunicae auratis militibus uersicolores, argentatis linteae candidae. His dextrum cornu datum: illi in sinistro consistunt.

So far as we have observed there is no trace of loss in any of our MSS., but the combined evidence of Donatus (Keil's *Gram. Lat.* IV. 542¹) and Nonius (194. 20 s.v. *balteus*) attributes to Livy (Nonius says *ex Libro VIII.*) two brief passages which seem to belong here, though no one hitherto has succeeded in finding a place for them free from difficulty.

Nonius quotes these words: *auratae uaginae, aurata baltea illis erant.*

Georges proposed to put this in § 2 after *exercitus erant*, which must be wrong, as it would gild the scabbards and belts of the Silver army as well as of the Golden.

The citation of Donatus and Probus is briefer: *erant et equorum in aurata tapeta*. This L. Mueller proposed to append to the scabbards and belts and to insert the whole after *adderent* in § 3, prefacing it however by a little free composition,² attributing these details to the cavalry.

The words appear perfectly Livian, and we quite agree with Georges and Müller that they fit no other passage so well as the present. Can we find a place for them?

By the help of the linear method, which has already been used with what we hope the reader will regard as at least some degree of success (see above on 8. 8. 4, pp. 11 sq.), and keeping to our norm of eighteen to nineteen letters for the uncial line, modified only by the preference (often shown in the Veronensis) for ending a line with the end of a word if it can be done without too much waste of space, we propose to insert them after *linteae candidae* (§ 3), inventing *de nostro* only a parallel clause (which we give in italics) about the 'silver' army, thus:

TISLINTEAECANDIDAE
hisuaginae argenteae
baltea argentea AVRA
 TAEVAGINAE AVRATABA
 LTEAILLISERANTETE Q
 VORVMINAVRATATAPETA
 HISDEXTRVMCORNVDATV

Or in more legible form:

Tunicae auratis militibus uersicolores, argentatis linteae candidae. <His uaginae argenteae, baltea argentea>: auratae uaginae,

¹ Probus also (ib. IV. 129) quotes the phrase, but ascribes it to Lucilius or Vergil. It is not in Vergil; if it came from Lucilius, L. Mueller's

aurata for *inaurata* would be plausible.

² Sed maxime equitum facies oculos in se conuertit.

aurata baltea illis erant, et equorum inaurata tapeta.
His dextrum cornu datum.

We suppose that the loss arose through the recurrence of the word *his* at the beginning of a line. The addition of the silvered scabbards and belts seems necessary for its own sake, whereas the detail about the horse-cloths reads more like an after-thought which could be allowed to suggest (without demanding precise statement) how the horses of the 'silver' men were draped—presumably in white, to match their riders' tunics. This restoration has the advantage of putting the 'golden' army on the right, which seems a priori their proper place (though nothing follows to determine it) instead of on the left.

No such conjecture can claim more than a reasonable degree of probability; but we are convinced that none ought to be accepted which does not offer some intelligible reason for the loss, and which does not adapt itself to the linear system of the uncial archetype.

C. F. WALTERS.
R. S. CONWAY.

(To be continued.)

ADDENDA.

We have again to thank Professor Postgate and Professor Anderson for valuable comments on the proofs of this article, and we now desire to make the following additions to it:

1. For suggested *conuictam* (p. 99) Professor Postgate points to one of many closer parallels, especially in the use of an Ablative, in Cic. *Verr. Act.* I. 4. 10, *istius uitam tot uitis flagitiisque conuictam*.

2. 'On *quanto maximo* (p. 101) Snakenburg's note runs: *quanto maximo*] Sic supra Curt. IV. 13. 36; u. etiam Caes. *B.G.* V. 28. Here Davies (cited by Oudendorp *ad loc.*) adds nothing beyond a reference to Livy XLIV. 27. 12 [*v. inf.*]. But in Curt. IV. 8. 10 *maxime* has strong MS. support, and is adopted by Vogel, the Teubner editor. The upshot is that Curtius, like Livy, used both forms. Snak. and Davies do no more than show that the construction with the Adjective is not wrong. Freinsh. and Acid. contribute nothing but unsupported dogmatism.'—W. B. A. It appears further that when Curtius used the Adverb, he did not feel, as Livy seems to have felt, constrained to put it immediately before the *potuit*.

3. (Agreement of *maximus*). Further examples of type (a) will be found in 22. 6. 6; 24. 21. 4; 27. 41. 4; 36. 44. 4; and 42. 15. 1, if with Gronov we regard *eximia* of Vindobon. as a corruption of *maxima*. The examples of type (b) may be subdivided into (b) those from 23. 16. 12; 24. 35. 5; 27. 43. 12; 28. 1. 6, with others in 28. 36. 2 and 44. 27. 12, in which the noun, though not preceding the verb *possum*, is thrown closely together with it by the balance of

the clauses; and (c) those in 10. 29. 9; 24. 35. 5 (Madvig), with others in 27. 49. 1 (quanto maximo poterat ictu adigebat), 28. 8. 2 and 42. 7. 6, in which the noun lies between the two verbs and cannot be clearly attached to one more than to the other. In one example only, so far as we have found, is the noun clearly detached from the *possum* clause: 37. 59. 1 (dis immortalibus quantus maximus poterat habitus est honos).

4. So in all the passages in (b) and (c) above.

5. 'Gronov's instinct seems to coincide in a most interesting way with these conclusions. He differs only by reading *maximae* in 24. 35. 5; in 21. 41. 4 he falls in with your principle by reading *quanta maxima celeritate potui*. On 9. 10. 10 Luterbacher observes that in the later books Livy shows a preference for the adjective.'—W. B. A. Luterbacher's observation is clearly just.

C. F. W.

R.-S. C.

ON TWO PASSAGES IN THE *PHAEDO*.

84 B. *ξῆν τε οἶται οὕτω δεῖν . . . καὶ . . . ἀφικομένη ἀπάλλαττεσθαι*. Surprise has been expressed at this nominative after *οἶται δεῖν*. Cf. *Magna Moralia* II. xi. 31, οὐκ οἶονται δεῖν αὐτοὶ φιλεῖν ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῶν ἐνδεεστέρων οἶονται δεῖν αὐτοὶ φιλεῖσθαι. Herodian *Hist.* I. x. 4, ψῆθη δεῖν μέγα τι δράσας κατορθῶσαι. Isocrates ix. 30, οὐχ ἡγήσατο δεῖν χωρίον ὄχυρὸν καταλαβὼν καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ καταστήσας περιδεῖν. . . . Either such phrases were so common that *οἶμαι δεῖν* came to be thought of as a single word, in which *δεῖν* did not count, or else this use comes from adding *δεῖν* superfluously to a primitive use of *οἶμαι* with an infinitive. It is of course common enough to say *οἶμαι φιλεῖν* in good Attic for 'I think fit to love.' I should prefer the latter hypothesis myself: *οἶμαι* is properly to 'carry' or 'bear'; so *οἶμαι φιλεῖν* is 'I propose to love,' and then *δεῖν* was added, especially when *οἶμαι* had come to mean 'I think.' There is a good instance of the primitive use of *οἶω* in *Odys.* xix. 312, *οἶδ' ἀνὰ θυμὸν οἶεται*: surely this is simply 'it is borne in upon my mind,' '*je suis porté à croire*.' Anyhow *οἶμαι* or *ἡγοῦμαι* *δεῖν* may be followed by a nominative and infinitive.

95 B. *τὸν λόγον τὸν μέλλοντα ἔσεσθαι*. Naturally *ἔσεσθαι* has been found very unsatisfactory; I think it is the mutilated remnant of *ῥηθήσεσθαι*, for *μέλλω* and *ῥηθήσεσθαι* often go together. See 88 C, *Politicus* 295 B, *Epist.* 343 C, *Dem.* xxv. 1, lxvi. 34, Polybius I. xiii. 9.

ARTHUR PLATT.

A METRICAL POINT IN LVCRETIVS.

It seems to have been assumed that Lucretius elides final *s* promiscuously, as Ennius does, at any part of the line. The following statement of facts will show that the truth is very different: I take all cases where the reading appears certain. (1) He has twenty-eight such elisions at the end of the fifth foot, including the emended ii. 623, 975, 986, v. 1410; (2) ten at the weak caesura of the fifth foot, including the emended iii. 198, 1016, v. 949, 1106. But except in these two positions the elision is quite rare and exceptional. I will begin the exceptions by giving (3) a peculiar group: ii. 5, *omni' sit*. 458, *omnibu' sunt* (Lamb.), 1079, *aliquoiu' siet* (Gronov.), iv. 493, *coloribu' sint*, 1152, *corpore' sunt*, 1268, *opu' sunt*, v. 456, *minoribu' sunt*, 1445, *priu' sunt*; all these are from the first four feet, but evidently to Lucretius a combination like *opu' sunt* is very different from, say, *opu' fit*. Indeed, I take it that *opusit* was to him just one word like *necessesit*; the following *s* in *sit* and *sunt* helps, perhaps, and so the solitary instance in Catullus is before *s*; at any rate, this group is obviously exceptional. There remain (4) only two elisions at the end of the fourth foot, iv. 1035 and the emended vi. 972; two at the end of the second foot, *immutabili'* in i. 591, and *immortalibu'* in v. 53, both due to correctors and both words of a form which is rare at the opening of a line; one in weak fourth caesura, iii. 905; one at end of first foot, i. 978. You will hardly believe me, but those are all.

Evidently these facts must be carefully considered by emenders of the poet. Munro's *moenibu'* in the first foot of iv. 82 introduces an elision almost unique for him, for no one, I suppose, believes in *sensibu' sedatum* at ii. 462, any more than in Purmann's *mollin' saecula* at v. 1064. Further doubt is thrown upon the already doubtful or worse than doubtful proposals of *nemu' subsistens* at ii. 359, *nimi' miraculorum* at iv. 594, *claru' citat* at v. 947, *subu' sic* at v. 970, *lapi' cumque* at vi. 550; and I know of many more, but have not been careful to collect such errors. But one choice specimen is worth quoting, because it illustrates another point. Lachmann at iv. 862 proposes, Munro and Giussani accept, the horrible reading '*ex animalibu'*. <Quae> quia sunt . . .' Even Ennius hardly allows this elision before a stop, Lucretius never: the curtailed word is always closely connected with the next. Naturally, since such a license is much milder when the words are run together, just as in English we have '*i' faith*,' etc., but could not have '*i'*' before any kind of pause.

The elision is especially common in words ending with the syllable *-bus*: no less than twenty-four out of the twenty-eight in my first class come under this head. Probably Lucretius used the elision in general more freely than appears from the figures here given, for emendation is required in thirteen of the fifty-two, but the proportions of the four classes may be presumed to have been much the same in his MS.: at least, I can see no reason why corruption should be less rife in the fifth foot of the line than elsewhere. It may be said that three out of six in my fourth class have been corrupted, but the numbers involved are there much too small to exclude accident. Lucilius approximates somewhat to Lucretius in his usage.

ARTHUR PLATT.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

LITERATURE AND GENERAL.

American Journal of Philology. XXXVIII. 4. 1917.

W. M. Lindsay, *The St. Gall Glossary*. Its contents are analyzed with the object of determining its sources—Placidus, pseudo-Placidus, Festus, Isidore, etc. A. L. Frothingham, *Vediovis, the Volcanic God: a Reconstruction*. The cult of Vediovis was centred at Alba in a volcanic region. The goat which we find mentioned in connexion with his statue on the Capitol points to the under-world. The *fulmen Veiovis* is the subterranean lightning of volcanic eruptions. B. L. Gildersleeve, *An Oxford Scholar*. An account of Ingram Bywater's life and personality, based on Dr. W. W. Jackson's Life. W. Sherwood Fox, *Greek Inscriptions in the Royal Ontario Museum* (concluded). Transcription and comments.

Berliner philologische Wochenschrift. 1917-1918.

Sept. 15. A. Siegmund, *De Senecae consolationibus*. Pars III (Hosius). M. Schamberger, *De declamationum Romanarum argumentis observationes selectae* (Ammon). K. Hauser, *Grammatik der griechischen Inschriften Lykiens* (Hiller von Gaertringen). E. v. Stern, *Volkskraft und Staatsmacht im Altertum* (Lenschau). B. Moritz, *Der Sinaikult in heidnischer Zeit* (Thomsen). O. Crusius, *Der griechische Gedanke im Zeitalter der Freiheitskriege* (J. Ziehen). A. W. de Groot, *Eine neue Methode der Klauselforschung*. 'Man solle die Klauselnzahlen nicht in ihrem absoluten Wert, sondern nur im Vergleich mit dem Satzrhythmus beurteilen.'

Sept. 22. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Part XI. and XII. ed. by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt (Pfeiffer). K. Meister, *Lateinisch griechische Eigennamen*. Heft 1 (Liechtenhan). I. Ch. Thallon, *Readings in Greek history* (Lenschau). The translations are inaccurate. O. Schroeder, *Allerneueste Metrik*. Von Wilamowitz's view that the lesser Asclepiad is composed of a choriamb and a glyconic is confirmed by the Oxyrhynchus Alcaeus (1234 fr. 2), e.g. $\phi\epsilon\tau\tau\alpha\kappa\tilde{\omega} \delta\epsilon \mid \delta\iota\delta\omicron\iota\varsigma \kappa\tilde{\upsilon}\delta\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\rho\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$. Th. Stangl, *Nichtdeklinerter Inf. Fut. Aktiv: zu Curtius IX. 1, 2*. Oelenheinz, *Eine unbekannte Cäsarstelle*. In a correspondence between two German Pastors in 1651, preserved at Schweinfurt, a quotation is made from Caesar B.G. 4. 18 on the authority of Didacus Nomesseius which differs from the traditional text and makes mention of a German god Lollus.

Sept. 29. E. Klostermann, *Späte Vergeltung. Aus der Geschichte der Theodicee* (Bock). A. von Domaszewski, *Die Geographie bei den Scriptoribus historiae Augustae* (Hohl). Derselbe, *Die Daten der Scriptoribus historiae Augustae von Severus Alexander bis Carus* (Hohl). E. Pokorny, *Studien zur griechischen Geschichte im sechsten und fünften Jahrzehnt des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Lenschau). P. Barth, *Die Geschichte der Erziehung in soziologischer und geistesgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung*. 2. A. (J. Ziehen). A. Dyroff, *Zu Herakleitos*. W. Bannier, *Zu attischen Inschriften*. VIII.

Oct. 6. *Griechische Texte aus Agypten*, hrsg. u. erkl. von P. M. Meyer. I. II. (Zucker). H. Kramer, *Quid valeat ὁμόνοια in literis Graecis* (Nestle). J. Wackernagel, *Neue oskische Inschriften aus Messana*. J. Sieveking, *Die Orientierung der Ara Pacis Augustae*. O. Keller, *Zu Varro rer. rust. II 1*. For *rotas* would read *rupicapras*. B. A. Müller, *Die Hamburger Antikensammlung Reimers*.

Oct. 13. E. Michon, *Un Décret du dème de Cholargos relatif aux Thesmophories* (L. Ziehen). K. Deissner, *Paulus und Seneca* (Posselt). St. Witkowski, *Zu einem euböischen Epigramm*. IG. xii. 9 No. 287. The epigram should be read ἐνθάδε Φίλων κεῖται. τὸν δὲ κατὰ γὰρ ἐκάλυσεν | ναῦτιλον. ὃ (=ὁς) ψυχῇ κ.τ.λ. G. Gardikas, *Lexikographische Bemerkungen*. K. Scherling, *Ein Plantuszeit aus Rheinzabern?* thinks that an inscribed potsherd found here (CIL. xiii. 3. 10012. 24, p. 459), and hitherto read as *Te dum o digna* or *Tedumo digna* should be read as *Ted amo Digna* and takes the first two words to be a quotation from *Casina* 232. O. Keller, *Zu Caelius (Apicius) de re coquinaria VI, c. 2 § 215*.

Oct. 20. J. Kohn, *Führende Denker* (Nestle). E. Löfstedt, *Arnobiana* (Baehrens). Adh. d'Alès, *L'édit de Calliste* (Preuschen). J. Sieveking, *Die Terrakotten der Sammlung Loeb*. II (Pagenstecher). A. Kurfess, *Zu Caesar*, B. G. V 56, 2 would punctuate, 'concilium indicit—hoc more Gallorum est initium belli—; quo lege communi, etc.'

Oct. 27. *L. Junii Moderati Columellae opera quae exstant recens.* V. Lundström II. (Becher). W. H. Roscher, *Die Zahl 50 in Mythos, Kultus, Epos und Taktik der Hellenen und anderer Völker* (Nestle). Fr. von den Velden, *Neue Wege zur Ursprache der Alten Welt* (Hermann). J. Tolkiehn, *Bemerkungen zu den Fragmenten römischer Schriftsteller*. II. W. Bannier, *Zu attischen Inschriften*. IX. W. Weinberger, 'ΟΞΥΡΥΧΟΣ. Oelenheinz, *Zum Namen Cicero*. Attempts to connect the name Cicero with the sorceress Circe, and thinks that his view is supported by the fact that Cicero was an augur.

Nov. 3. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta quae manserunt omnia*. Orationem fasc. 21-27. 29 rec. A. Klotz et F. Schöll (Busche). I. K. Miller, *Itineraria Romana* (Anthes). *Sammlung des Herrn Joh. Horský in Wien*. Antike Münzen, Griechen, Römer, Byzantiner (Anthes). H. F. Müller, *Kritisches und Exegetisches zu Plotinos*. V. B. A. Müller, *Der Artikel ANTIQVITEZ in den Scaligerana secunda von 1667*. I.

Nov. 10. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta quae manserunt omnia*. Orat. fasc. 21-27. 29; ed. min. fasc. 27 rec. A. Klotz et F. Schöll (Busche). II. E. Berger, *Die Wachsmalerei des Apelles und seiner Zeit* (Herrmann). W. Unverzagt, *Die Keramik des Kastells Alzei* (Anthes). B. A. Müller, *Der Artikel ANTIQVITEZ in den Scaligerana secunda von 1667*. II.

Nov. 17. F. Heerdeggen, *De vocum sponte et ultro apud vetustiores scriptores Latinos vi atque usu commentationis semasiologiae pars prior 1914, pars altera 1916* (Köhm). J. Kerkai, *Quomodo Horatius Lucili vestigia presserit?* (Röhl). M. H. Boehm, *Der Sinn der humanistischen Bildung* (Cauer). W. Bannier, *Zu griechischen Inschriften*. I.

Nov. 24. K. Manitius, *Des Claudius Ptolemaeus Handbuch der Astronomie*. I. II. (Tittel). C. C. Clinton, *The technique of continuous action in Roman comedy* (Klotz). Praised. M. Henschel, *Zur Sprachgeographie Südwestgalliens* (Philipp). V. Gardthausen, *Studien zu Ammianus Marcellinus*. I. On the older manuscripts.

Dec. 1. G. Wolterstorff, *Zwei alte Odysseuslieder in der Ilias* (Eberhard). *Archimedis opera omnia cum commentariis Eutocii iterum ed.* J. L. Heiberg (Tittel). J. Odenthal, *De formarum faxo faxim similium in enuntiatis secundariis conditionalibus positivarum usu Plautino* (Klotz). E. Cocchia, *Romanzo e Realtà nella vita e nell'attività letteraria di Lucio Apuleio* (Werner). M. C. P. Schmidt, *Kulturhistorische Beiträge zur Kenntnis des griechischen und römischen Altertums*. 1. Heft: *Zur Entstehung und Terminologie der elementaren Mathematik*. 2. A. (Tittel). Derselbe, *Altphilologische Beiträge*. 2. Heft: *Terminologische Studien*. 2. A. (Tittel). O. Rossbach, *Hesiods*

Weltbild und zu seinen neuen Bruchstücken. W. Schmid, *Zu Lykophron Alexandra* 794. V. Gardthausen, *Studien zu Ammianus Marcellinus*. II. The younger MSS.

Dec. 8. F. Löwy-Cleve, *Die Philosophie des Anaxagoras* (H. F. Müller). *Heronis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt omnia*. Vol. V.: *Heronis quae feruntur stereometrica et de mensuris* ed. J. L. Heiberg (Tittel). C. Morawski, *De scriptoribus latinis novae observationes* (Plantus—Livius—Ovidius—Apuleius) (Klotz). G. Geissler, *Ad descriptionum historiam symbola* (Tolkiehn). Kopp, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*. 9. A. (K. Fr. W. Schmidt). A. Walde, *Über älteste sprachliche Beziehungen zwischen Kelten und Italikern* (Brugmann). R. Berndt, *Zum altsprachlichen Unterricht*. W. Schmid, *Die Datierung der gefälschten Urkunden in der Kranzrede des Demosthenes*. These forgeries come from Asia, and *Oxyrhynchus papyrus* 1377 is held to prove that they are as early as the first century B.C. G. Helmreich, *Zu Celsus*. W. Soltau, *Julius Capitolinus*.

Dec. 15. D. Einhorn, *Xenophanes* (H. F. Müller). C. Brakman, *Miscella tertia* (Baehrens). H. G. Ringeling, *Pragmatismus in Edward Gibbons Geschichte vom Verfall und Untergang des Römischen Reiches* (Achelis). O. Weinreich, *Triskaidekadische Studien* (Boll). A. Springer, *Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte*. I. Das Altertum. 10. A. Nach A. Michaelis bearb. von P. Wolters (Sauer). K. Woermann, *Geschichte der Kunst aller Zeiten und Völker*. 2. A. I. (Sauer). E. Krüger, *Die bisherigen Ergebnisse der Trierer Kaiserpalastausgrabung* (Anthes). J. H. Lipsius, *Kratippos*. A criticism of Kalinka's and Walker's views.

Dec. 22. M. Dessoir und P. Menzer, *Philosophisches Lesebuch*. 4. A. (R. Graeber). H. Steuding, *Edelsteine griechischen Schrifttums* (Becher). H. Brinkmann, *Anonyme Fragmente römischer Historiker bei Livius* (Rossbach). W. Schmid, *Flavia Solva* (Anthes). P. Mestwerdt, *Die Anfänge des Erasmus: Humanismus und 'devotio moderna'*. Mit einer Lebensskizze von C. H. Becker hrsg. von H. von Schubert (Achelis). W. Fox, *Zu Demosthenes' Kranzrede* § 12 ff. II. M. Wallies, *Aristotelea*.

Dec. 29. K. Gatzert, *De Nova comoedia quaestiones onomatologicae* (Poland). K. Mras, *Die Personennamen in Lucians Hetärengesprächen* (Poland). H. B. Vroom, *De Commodiani metro et syntaxi Annotationes* (Tolkiehn). H. Sitte, F. v. Duhn, K. Schumacher, *Der Germanensarkophag Ludovisi im Römisch-germanischen Zentralmuseum in Mainz* (Anthes). Chr. Johnen, *Kurzgefasste Geschichte der Stenographie* (Mentz). E. H. Zimmermann, *Vorkarolingische Miniaturen* (Lehmann). V. Gardthausen, *Studien zu Ammianus Marcellinus*. K. E. Illing, *Inschriften aus Histria*. Greek and Roman inscriptions found in 1917 at Caranasuff, north of Constanza.

Jan. 5. J. Basson, *De Cephalae et Planudae syllogisque minoribus* (Klotz). G. Wolff, *Die geographischen Voraussetzungen der Chattenfeldzüge des Germanicus* (Anthes). M. Radin, *The Jews among the Greeks and Romans* (Liebenam). Severely criticized. E. Drerup, *Die Griechen von heute* (Poland). Marsilius Ficinus, *Über die Liebe oder Platons Gastmahl*, übersetzt von K. P. Hasse (B. A. Müller). H. F. Müller, *Kritisches und Exegetisches zu Plotinos*. VI. On *Enn.* vi. 1.

Jan. 19. O. Apelt, *Platons Staat*. 4. A. (Becher). M. Jahn, *Die Bewaffnung der Germanen in der älteren Eisenzeit* (Anthes). F. Ruess, *Ausführungen zum Tironischen Schriftwesen* (Mentz). A. Kunze, *Zu Sallust C.* 59. 3. P. Lehmann, *Neues von Franciscus Modius*.

Jan. 26. A. Heusler, *Deutscher und antiker Vers. Der falsche Spondeus und angrenzende Fragen* (Pfeiffer). *Vocabularium iurisprudentiae Romanae*. Tom. V. fasc. II. ed. B. Kübler (Klotz). VIII. Bericht der Römisch-germanischen Kommission des kais. Archäol. Instituts 1913-1915 (Anthes). Mitteilungen: W. Bannier, *Zu IG II* 140.

Feb. 2. A. Kolbe, *Titanen und Philosophen nach Diogenes Laertius* (Von der Mühl). F. Jäger, *Rhetorische Beiträge zu Rutilius Claudius Namatianus* (Helm). B. Raabe, *De genetivo Latino capita tria* (Hermann). A. v. Mess, *Caesar* (Quaatz). W. Bannier, *Zu IG II* 140. II.

Classical Philology. XIII. 1. 1918.

W. M. Lindsay, *Bird-Names in Latin Glossaries* (with notes by D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson). A specimen attempt towards the construction of a Dictionary of Latin Glosses, based on the Philoxenus, 'Abolita,' and 'Abstrusa' collections, with comments on the origin and identification of the names of birds included therein. Ivan M. Linforth, *οἱ ἀβαυαρίφορες* (Herodotus IV. 93-96). Examination of the significance of the phrases *οἱ ἀβαυαρίφορες* and *οἱ ἀπαβαυαρίφορες* applied to the Getae. The passages reviewed show that *ἀβαυαρίφειν* is either (1) transitive 'deify,' or (2) intransitive 'act the part of a deity,' *ἀπαβαυαρίφειν* being only (1). The phrase *οἱ ἀβ.* is a nickname of the Getae (with whose stiff monotheism the Greeks had no sympathy), originally applied to the Pythagoreans, the Getae's deified Zamolxis having been, according to the legend, a slave of Pythagoras. E. T. Merrill, *Some Remarks on Cases of Treason in the Roman Commonwealth*. To *perduellio*, the earliest word for 'treason,' was added the phrase *maiestatem p. Romani imminuere*, which was preferable as conveying no sense of 'warfare.' The general meaning of the word is observable in the proceedings against Horatius (Livy I. 26); but the process is of no great antiquity. Another method of dealing with supposed traitors was the *senatus consultum ultimum*, the formula in which was not fixed even as early as the Gracchi. Cicero at the time of the Catilinarian conspiracy attempted to make the principle of this *consultum* an integral part of the constitution; but the attempt was a disastrous failure. J. A. Scott, *Non-Odyssean Words found in the Iliad*. Statistics and classified lists. The practical conclusion is that 'nothing in Homer should be rejected because it is used rarely or but once; even the absence of a word or construction is by itself no proof that the word or construction was unknown or out of favour.' A. F. Bräunlich, *The Confusion of the Indirect Question and the Relative Clause in Latin*. A collection of over forty passages in which such confusion is probable or possible, made in the hope that it 'might have some influence towards establishing a more conservative attitude towards our Latin texts.' C. D. Buck, *Studies in Greek Noun-Formation* (continued). On the words with genitive in -ιτος, -κτος, -πτος.

Classical Weekly (New York). 1917.

May 14. C. H. Moore, *The Religious Thought of the Greeks* (W. S. Fox). The aim of these ten lectures was 'to present within a moderate compass an historical account of the progress of Greek religions through something over a thousand years. No attempt has been made . . . to deal with pre-Hellenic origins . . . The lectures deal with the higher ranges of Greek thought, and at times have much to do with philosophy and theology.' A. D. F. Hamlin, *A History of Ornament, Ancient and Mediaeval* (J. G. Winter). 'A thoroughly scholarly work, which will doubtless be recognized as authoritative for many years to come. . . . Especially gratifying is the frank appreciation of the contributions of the Roman genius.'

May 21. B. B. Rogers, *The Clouds of Aristophanes* (M. W. Humphries). The reviewer disagrees with the author's view that the revised play was not intended for performance. 'The commentary excellently elucidates allusions to people and events.'

Oct. 15. W. S. Fox, *Greek and Roman Mythology* (D. M. Robinson). This is the first of a series of thirteen volumes on the 'Mythology of all Races.' 'The author has done a difficult task systematically and exceedingly well.' B. C. Rider, *The Greek House* (T. L. Shear). The book does not throw new light on the subject, but is useful in putting together much information, some of which is not easily accessible.

Oct. 22. Lane Cooper, *A Concordance to the Works of Horace* (C. K.). Superior to any other index to Horace. For a few words references only are given; for the

rest the text is given, and fully enough to illustrate the use of the word. The arrangement and printing are excellent. Price \$7. Published by the Carnegie Institution of Washington. J. B. Edwards, *The Demesman in Attic Life* (G. W. Botsford). 'Although readers could wish for a more complete, mature and constructive treatment, they will certainly find the material gathered from Greek literature both interesting and valuable.' M. J. Byrne, *Prolegomena to an Edition of the works of Ausonius* (J. C. Rolfe). 'This book comprises a Life of Ausonius, chapters on his Friends and Correspondence, his Works, the History of the Text, and Metre and Prosody.' There is 'a very complete Bibliography.'

Oct. 29. C. W. Mendell, *Latin Sentence Connection* (H. C. Nutting). 'The psychological background does seem somewhat irrelevant and not clearly thought out; and the emphasis placed on such factors as repetition is thoroughly misleading; the real merit of the work lies in the care expended upon the large mass of material examined, and in the thoughtful observations upon the (variously defined) types of sentence relation found.'

Nov. 12. E. S. Bouchier, *Syria as a Roman Province* (R. Van D. Magoffin). This book 'will certainly increase the author's reputation.'

Nov. 19. Professor Lane Cooper contributes an interesting paper on a course entitled 'English Translations of Greek and Latin Classics' which he has given for some years at Cornell University.

Dec. 10. Prof. Tenny Frank contributes a paper on 'The Economic Interpretation of Roman History.'

Dec. 17. H. Weir Smyth, *A Greek Grammar for Schools and Colleges* (C. F. Smith). A book for teachers rather than students . . . 'but the good student when he looks for explanations will find them to an extent almost unbelievable in a work of 500 pages.'

1918. Jan. 14. René Dussaud, *Les civilisations préhelléniques dans le bassin de la Mer Égée*. Second edition (T. L. Shear). 'On the whole, the work is to be recommended strongly as an interesting, well written, rather popular review of the entire subject.'

Mnemosyne. XLV. 4.

W. Vollgraff describes a wooden tablet recently found in Friesland, recording the purchase of a cow by a merchant from a native with names of Roman soldiers as witnesses. V. gives reasons for dating the tablet A.D. 116. J. J. Hartman on Aristophanes, *Pax* 700-3: ἀπέθανεν (sc. Κρατίνος) ὅθ' οἱ Λάκωνες ἐνέβαλον . . . ὥρακιάσας· οὐ γὰρ ἐξηνέσχετο ἰδὼν πίθον καταγνύμενον οἶνον πλέων, thinks (with Cobet) that the words οἱ Λ. ἐνέβαλον refer to a scene in a recent comedy (possibly Plato's *Lacones*) in which the stage was invaded by tipsy revellers. Cratinus, however, is not introduced (as Cobet thought) because he died the same year as the said comedy appeared; on the contrary, his presence in the audience added point to the joke at the expense of his love for liquor. A. R. Van der Loeff discusses the Eleusinian formula ἐνίστευσα, ἔπιον τὸν κυκεῶνα, ἔλαβον ἐκ κίστης, ἐργασάμενος ἀπεθέμην εἰς κάλαθον καὶ ἐκ καλάθου εἰς κίστην. He would understand ἔριον as the unexpressed object of the last three verbs, since Epiphanius speaks of ἐρέα ἐξεργασμένη among the Eleusinian symbols. P. H. Damsté, *Ad S. Aurelium Victorem*, contributes critical notes on the *Liber de Origine Gentis Romanae*. J. J. Hartman has notes on Plato, *Republic*. J. Van Wageningen, *Seneca and Juvenal*, infers from a comparison of Juvenal, *Sat.* VI., and St. Jerome, *Adv. Iovinianum* 313 c.—320 c., that the poet derived his material from Seneca's lost work *De Matrimonio*. J. C. Naber, continuing his studies in Roman Law, deals with 'Publica Determinationis Monumenta.' J. J. Hartman argues for explaining Soph. *Oed. Tyr.* 3. ἰκτηρίους κλάδοισιν ἐξεστεμμένοι 'qui

cum ramis vestris coronam effecistis,' *corona* being a ring outside which the person supplicated must not step till he has heard the prayer. Cf. Eur. *Suppl.* 20 sqq., esp. 36 sqq. M. Boas, *De Catonianis Librariorum Memorii duabus*, illustrates the tendency shown by scribes to insert unconsciously in the work which they are transcribing reminiscences of other authors with which they are familiar. J. J. Hartman on Hor. *Od.* III. 4, 2 supports the proposal of Polenar to emend 'tibia . . . longum . . . melos' to 'tibia . . . longa . . . melos.' For *tibia longa* cf. Rich. *Dict. Ant.* sub uoc.

Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica. XLVI. 1. 1918.

V. Moricca, *The Phoenissae of Seneca* (concluded). Deals with the sources of the play, emphasizing Seneca's debt to the *Oedipus Coloneus* and *Oedipus Rex* of Sophocles. C. Marchesi, *The Second and Third Books of the Ars Amatoria*. Examines the structure and sources of *Ars Amatoria* II. and III. R. Sabbadini, *A Quotation from Ennius in Cicero Brutus*. Attempts to rearrange the lines of Ennius quoted in Brutus 58-9 and also in A. Gellius XII. 2. The words 'flos delibatus populi suadaeque medulla' cannot form a single line. The 'que' is lacking in the MSS., the Florentine MS. giving 'suadat medulla,' the MSS. of Gellius 'suada medulla' or 'populis vada medulla.' This suggests 'suadai medulla' as the true reading, which cannot be combined in one line with the preceding words. A. Beltrami, *Emendations of Seneca*, Ep. II. 2. 14. For 'non damnatur latro, cum occidit' proposes 'non damnat latro, cum occidit,' the sense being that the accidents of fortune cannot affect the moral value of the virtuous life: the assassin may kill but cannot condemn his victim. For 'an sapienti opera rei p. danda sit' where the best MSS. have 'an sapientiora opera perdenda sint' proposes 'an sapienti ori opera perdenda sit' which is supported by the words used of Cato in § 13 'vociferatus est et misit irritas voces.' D. Bassi, *On a Review*. A reply to a review by Terzaghi of the first volume of the *Collectio Tertia* of *Herculaneum papyri*. E. Stampini, *Peculiarities in the Inscription of Allia Potestas*. (a) The line 'haec duo dum vixit iuvenes ita rexit amantes' seems to refer to a *ménage à trois*, an explanation supported by C.I.L. VI. 21200 'si nomen quaeris sum Lesbia, si duo amantes, Anchialus dulcis cum suave homini Spurio.' (b) 'infamis' in the sense of 'obscure' or 'unknown' is unique and unknown in juristic Latin. F. Calonghi, *Tibulliana I.* gives the results of a collation of Codex V. (*Vatic.* 3270), correcting some inaccuracies in the apparatus criticus of Baehrens. R. Sabbadini, *Pompeian Defixiones*. Discusses a 'defixio' from Pompeii (published in *Notizie degli Scavi* XIII. pp. 304-6, 1916) which belongs apparently to the second century B.C. and contains some peculiarities of spelling, e.g. the lack of the double consonant in 'capilu,' 'ilai,' 'sucedas,' 'posit,' the apocope of 'm' in 'capilu,' 'cerebru,' 'quiqua,' also the new verb 'diffigo,' etc. D. Bassi, *On a New Edition of the Agricola of Tacitus*. A long critical review of an edition by Annibaldi (in the *Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum*) which is founded mainly on the new *Codex Jesinus* discovered by the editor in 1902-3.

Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie. 1917.

Oct. 29 (Double number). F. Schwenn, *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern* (Nestle). Shows wide knowledge and a sure sense of method. W. Headlam, *Agamemnon with verse translation, introduction, and notes*. Ed. by A. C. Pearson (Süsskand). The edition departs too far from the recorded text, and is too dependent on traditional interpretations. Th. Meyer-Steineg, *Das medizinische System der Methodiker; eine Vorstudie zum Caelius Aurelianus* (Fuchs). Clear, with due emphasis on essentials.

Nov. 12. C. H. Johl, *Die Weberstühle der Griechen und Römer* (Blümner). R. Asmus, *Der Alkibiades Kommentar des Iamblichos als Hauptquelle für Kaiser Julian* (Schemmel).

he person
. 20 sqq.,
tendency
nscribing
rtman on
ngum . . .
ab uoc.

sources of
us Rex of
Examines
Quotation
quoted in
us populi
he MSS.,
edulla' or
ng, which
mendations
oses 'non
not affect
demn his
have 'an
enda sit'
isit irritas
st volume
ies in the
ita rexit
orted by
us dulcis
known' is
results of
apparatus
xio' from
a belongs
lling, e.g.
e apocope
D. Bassi,
dition by
ed mainly

iechen und
Headlam,
Pearson
ependent
ystem der
emphasis

Blümner).
iser Julian